# THE PLEA OF THE CHILDREN OF BELIEVING-PARENTS,

*for their Intereſt in* Abraham's *Covenant, their Right to Church-Member-ſhip with their Parents, and conſequently their Title to* BAPTISM.

The Cauſe of publiſhing this Diſcourſe after ſo many Learned Men have laboured in this Province, is declared in the *Preface* to the *Reader*.

---

*Baptizandos eſſe paruulos, nemo dubitet: quando nec illi hinc dubitant, qui ex parte aliqua Contradicunt.* Auguſt, *de verbis Apoſtoli.* Serm. 14.

---

It will ſurely be rewarded by Chriſt at the latter day, as a work of more then ordinary Charity, to have pleaded, and maintained the Right of theſe poor Members of his, who want a Tongue to ſpeak for themſelves.

Dr. *Tho. Goodwin*, in his *Preface* to Mr. *Cotton*, of *Infant-Baptiſm.*

---

By *GILES FIRMIN.*

---

1 Cor. 7. 14.——*Elſe were your Children Unclean, but now they are Holy.*

---

*LONDON*, Printed for *Tho. Simons*, at the *Princes Arms* in *Ludgate-Street*, near *Ludgate*, 1683.

D. WILLIAMS'S LIBRARY
RED CROSS STREET
LONDON.

# THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

IF the Reader *demands a reaſon, why after ſo many Books written by other Men (far more able then my ſelf) upon this Subject, that now I ſhould appear? my anſwer is ready. I had as few thoughts of writing, as any Man could have of reading any thing of mine upon the Subject. But hearing of a Book againſt* Infant-Baptiſm, *very much cryed up, and obſerving ſome diſcourſe about* Anabaptiſm *this Spring, more in the Town then ever I heard before, I ſent to borrow the Book, I took a brief view of it, and the Book was ſent for again. To ſpend the* Lord's-Day *ſo much as one Exerciſe upon any Controverſie, I did*

*much diſlike it, yet I thought I was bound to ſay ſomething to it, and did borrow a little time, before I went on my other courſe.*

*About ſix Weeks after I had done, comes down an* Anti-baptiſt *from* London, *to a Town Seven or Eight Miles diſtant from me, and writes me a Letter, informing me,* That he was one that did walk in Goſpel-Communion with Col. *Danvers*, (ſometimes he ſtiles him Eſq; *Danvers*) *then writes to me thus.* You have caſt the *Odium* of *Falſhood* and *Forgery* upon his Book to your *Auditory:* If it was to deter your Hearers from reading his Book, it doth demonſtrate the badneſs of your Cauſe, in that you are not willing it ſhould be inſpected. If you deſign thereby to degrade the Gentleman, as infamous, though unknown, you have therein greatly erred,——therefore I requeſt you on the behalf of Col. *Danvers*, that you be pleaſed to do him the common Juſtice, as to publiſh to the World in Print, what you have ſpoken in your more private Meetings, by way of detection of his *Forgery*,——and not only to Print what you have traduced him with

with, but alſo any other new things you have Preached, that will lend any aſſiſtance to your *Infant-Baptiſm*, that this Gentleman doth endeavour to throw down as a ſpurious thing;——ſeveral of your own Party have written againſt him, but he, with others, have ſo anſwered them, that they have ſet down ſilent under——The Collonel hath a better *Character* than you give of him,——he hath a large Portion of this Worlds goods, &c. *Thus he runs on in commendation of the Collonel, and ends it in ſuch a way, that neither I, nor others that read the Letter, could underſtand his meaning.*

*As to this Letter, the* Reader *may pleaſe to underſtand, the Book which I borrowed had in the Title Page, only* H. D. *I could not tell whither* D. *ſtood* for Den (*whoſe name I had ſeen*) *or* Dell, *or* Danvars, *of whoſe name only I had heard, but never ſaw any thing of his; but whoever was the* Author, *I found fault with him.* 1. *For his* Fallhood *in the Hiſtorical part* (*which if my Memory fails me not, took up above half his Book.*) 2ly, *His fraudulent dealing.*

3ly,

3ly, *His raising a dust upon the Scriptures he quotes, to trouble his* Reader. 4ly, *For his* Logick. *But for any other Opinions, or any thing concerning his Conversation, I speak not one word: for how could I, when I knew nothing of him, and only heard three times (as I remember) there was one Collonel* Danvers, *an* Anabaptist, *and that was all; nor was I certain the Book was his.*

*It was never my intent to answer every particular in his Book, partly because I would not spend the* Lord's Day *in Controversies, and partly because Catechizing was the thing I intended, being far more necessary, so that I did grudge the time I spent about this Book; out of which I only wrote the most material things, and the Book was sent for away.*

*For the new things, this* Epistoler *would have me publish. Doth he mean new Scriptures, or new Arguments, or both?*

1st. *Why new? since the old are not yet answered; it is one thing to write against Men, another to answer them.*

2ly, *Why new? since my* Author *borrows so much old out of Mr.* Tombes's *Book, which I look upon as* instar omnium, *and is the only* Anabaptist *Book I have.* 3ly,

3ly, *Why new? ſince my* Author *oppoſes old Texts, and I muſt take the part of a Reſpondent.*

4ly, *Why new? my* Epiſtoler *ſhould tell me what Controverſies are there, which have been handled ſo long, by very able Divines as this hath been, that he that comes laſt, hath wrote all new?*

5ly, *To conclude then, as to theſe new things, I am forced to take up the old Texts, becauſe of my* Author's *oppoſing them: I do but touch other Texts, and not inſiſt upon them, where others have been before me: for other Mens Arguments, I borrow but one from Mr.* Baxter, *and tell you whoſe it is, and improve it my way. If I have hit upon other Mens notions, it is unknown to me, as I ſee I have upon Mr.* Wills, *in anſwer to the old* Britains: *but I had given the anſwer in the Congregation, and wrote it in my Coppy, before I ſaw Mr.* Wills.

*For his crying* Victoria, *telling me our Divines* ſit ſilent under the Anſwers the Collonel, and his Party have given them. *If this* Epiſtoler, *read Mr.* Baxter's *Second Defence of Infants,* &c. *he may read a full anſwer*

*anſwer to this, and the reaſon of their ſilence,* p. 211. *We may allow ſome Honour to a Collonel, but why do they ſit ſilent? not becauſe the Collonel, or any other* Anabaptiſt *have put them to ſilence, by Arguments from Scripture, by Truth in Hiſtory, or Strength of Learning, the contrary appears to judicious* Readers: *but who will care for dealing with unreaſonable Men? They have other work to do of higher concernment: Let the* Anabaptiſts *indulge themſelves in their Opinions and Practiſes, if they pleaſe, I have performed that common Juſtice my* Epiſtoler *requires of me, only for brevities ſake, I left out ſeveral things I would have added; if this may do the Church of Chriſt any ſervice, I ſhall have my end, and bleſs God,*

Redgneſſ. 24. Auguſt, 1682.

G. FIRMIN.

---

THE

# THE PLEA OF THE CHILDREN OF Beleiving-Parents, &c.

THE Right of the Children of Beleiving-Parents to Church-Membership with their Parents, and consequently to Baptism, was never so strongly opposed, nor better defended, than it hath been within these forty yearts in this *English* Nation. I think there is enough Written to satisfie the minds of sober Christians; but the Enemy of the Church is not yet quiet, nor will be, till the Church Militant becomes Triumphant.

A difference we may obſerve between Chriſtians now, and thoſe in former times in *England*, ſince I can remember: How wary were they then, what Doctrines they received: Tho' they would not pin their Faith upon any Mans Sleeve, yet they would conſider what Perſons they were for ſoundeſt of Faith, and Holineſs in Converſation, from whom they would receive any Doctrine, which hath made me wonder many times how this Doctrine of *Anti-Pædo Baptiſm*, which was firſt hatch'd in the Brain of that Notorious *Heretick* [for ſo upon ſearch I find him] *Auxentius*, Chereſhed by *Pelagius*, and afterwards revived by Men of corrupt Minds, and lewd Converſations; as that Learned and Pious *Martyr*, Mr. *Philpot* tells his Fellow Priſoner in *Newgate*, That this wretched Doctrine, as Mr. *Thomas Hooker* calls it, ſhould find entertainment in the Hearts of any truly Godly as it hath done in *England* of late: At this, as I ſaid, I have wondered! For this was not the frame of the Right Old *Engliſh Puritans*, they would have abhorred the Doctrine for the Authors ſake. Good Mr. *Teſſey*, I knew between 50 and 60 years ſince, but then I heard of no Inclination this way: and one I have met with, truly Pious, found in all other Points humble, made

no noise of his Opinion, [whither *Re-baptised*, I cannot tell] with him we held Communion in the *Holy Supper*.

To me it seems strange, and so strange, that I will never believe it, That Christ should Promise his Spirit to his Church, and that good Spirit should suffer both his *Martyrs* and choice *People* to err in such a Point [if it be an Error] from the Apostles days to this day. Since the Reformation, I believe *England*, *Scotland*, and *Ireland*, have, through Gods Rich Grace, afforded as many Holy, Heavenly, Gracious, and Learned Men, as any Nations under the Sun; As smart Enemies to *Mystical Babylon*, [of which the *Anabaptists* tells us, Infant-Baptism is a Relique] as any *Anabaptists* can be; and have done more against that *Babylon*, than all the *Anabaptists* that ever were or shall be, have done, or can do: and till of late years, I never heard of one [what others have done I know not] that did approve, but did detest this Doctrine, till our unhappy Wars: in which time, and since that time, this Doctrine is much spread.

May I have leave to inquire what should occasion the spreading of this Opinion in this Nation, besides the Soveraign pleasure of God, whose wayes, may suffer a Gracious Man to err in some particu-

lar] I have thought of these Causes.

*First*, The first and chief Reason was, even good Men did not improve their *Father-Abrahams-Covenant*, nor their *Infant-Baptism Covenant*, as they ought. Hence not improving these, they did not experience the goodness of God in them, and our advantage by them; Then no wonder tho' Men in times of Dispute and Temptations, be at a loss, and come at last to deny that, which others, who have improved and experienced, have found to be a greater priviledge, advantage, and support to their Souls, under their fears, and other temptations.

Experiences (you say) unless well grounded upon Scriptures, are but deluding Fancies; I know it very well, therefore the grounds have been well weighed. On the other side, tho' the Scriptures be plain, yet the Gospel, and things apprehended only by Faith, are such, and Temptations about them [especially in some Men] so strong, that if a Man hath not attained to some experience of what he doth believe, if his Faith hath not brought in some Spiritual Sense, in the *Hurricanes* of long and strong Temptations, a Mans Faith will be terribly shaken in the very Gospel it self. The wind having blown at that Door before. I could not but take special notice of what the worthy Au-

thor

thor of the Book, Intituled, *The fulfilling of Scriptures*, hath told us concerning that Holy Man, and Eminent Servant of Christ, Mr. *Bruce*, telling his People, *I think it to be a greater matter to beleive there is a God, than people judge*, p. 430. The same Author speaking about *Experience* [from his own *Experience* I doubt not] how it helps to Witness that great Truth of *Godhead*, p. 111. in the next Page, 112. speaks thus, *It is not the Contemplation of Nature in its highest flight, can answer such an Assault of the Devil, which may try the most Established Christian Adult in the being of a God*, &c. but then he shews how *Experience* of God helps the Soul. Whether these be not Truths, I leave it to those who have been long exercised with these Temptations; now if in that Point, as to the being of a God, than much more as to Gospel Truths: that no wonder the Apostle Prays, *that Beleivers may abound in all Knowledge and Sense*, ἐν αἰσθήσει 1 *Phil.* 9. we read *Judgment*, but the *Greek* word, and so the *Margent* tells you, is *Sense*. The *Arabick* word is very significant, *Grotius* and *Gomarus*, understand by *Sense*, *Experience*: *Hemmingius* and *Zanchie*, opens the word excellently.

Some Men are exercised with Temptations exceedingly more than others, and God

is pleased to be more Dark, or exceeding Dark to some over he is to others, which hath made me often think and say,

It is only Divine Teaching, and the experimental *Sense* of what is taught, that can make a sound Christian bear up and hold to the Word in the time of long and sore Temptations. I could here give a very sad but true Story, the like scarce ever heard before, pertinent to the Point in hand; but I fear the Devil would make ill use of it among tempted Christians, and therefore I will not commit it to Writing.

To return to the Head I am upon. If the *Anabaptists* say, *How can a Man improve a Nullity, and get Experience of it?* Abrahams *Covenant with the Seed of Believers, now is Null*, Infant-Baptism *is Null.* True, I do not know how a Man can improve a *Nullity*. But I doubt not there are many *Anabaptists* in *England*, who lived several years before they drank in this Opinion of *Anabaptism*, and in that time did not think *Abrahams Covenant*, nor their *Infant-Baptism* to be Null; many of them also had Parents not only visible, but real Christians; I appeal to their Consciences, did you in that time before you drank in this Opinion, improve the *Covenant*, and your *Infant-Baptism?* did you mind these? did you

you meditate well upon them? did you believe them upon these Meditations and Faith? did you follow God close and earnestly in Prayer for the benefits of them? and tho' you met with Temptations, yet did you hold on? and what, did God give you in nothing, no support, no relief, no comfort from these? did you find no advantage to your Souls by these? I will never believe it. God is gracious, God is faithful, what ever we think of him in our dark hours: I will rather believe they did not follow close their improvement of these, for I meet but with very few, even good Christians, tho' they hate *Anabaptism*, that do improve them as they ought. No wonder then tho' Men cry out, *Abrahams Covenant is Null*, and *Infant-Baptism Null*, when they never improved them, so found no good by them, and now turn *Anabaptists*.

I know Christians that lie under some Temptations, may, and do expect more from the *Covenant*, Promise, and Sacraments, than God intended, or the Scripture holds forth, they would make one Scripture contradict another: If God gives in but a little, and will suffer us to lie under our Temptations, but yet will supply us with so much from his *Covenant*, that we are able to hold up our hands in the day of

Battel: that our Hearts are kept close to him, and do not in the least depart from him; If we cannot get the fatted Calf, and Musick, *&c. Luke* 15. 23. [which some Christians have] if we can but get a Kid, and have a Father to own us at last, 'tis worth our Beleiving, Praying, and Writing.

What it was that Woman [a noted Midwife I knew] expected to find at the *Lords Supper*, I know not, but it seems she found it not: whereupon she forsooke the *Lords Table*, with this blasphemous Speech, *A Man may find as much good by a Loaf in the Bakers Shop, as by the Bread in the Lords Supper, for she had been often there and could find no good.* Hearing of this Speech, I inquired after her, by those who had been long acquainted with her [I know not whether I saw her after I heard it] they took her alwaies for a civil Woman, but did not think she was acquainted with the work of Regeneration; but that made me to wonder the more, for such persons commonly take up their Priest in the work done, in above partaking of the Ordinance.

If Christians be at this Point, we expect so much from Promises, so much from Ordinances, or we have nothing, then we may do as she did, throw off all Ordinances, and Promises too. Tho' I am far from attaining

ing what I have ſought and deſired, yet I bleſs God, ſo much I have attained from my underſtanding, and improving of *Abrahams Covenant*, and my *Infant-Baptiſm*, that I have but a light eſteem of all the *Anabaptiſts* Books againſt them, they ſignifie nothing with me: but of this, more hereafter.

Diſputing without experiencing, ſignifies little in Divinity to a tempted Soul. But this I doubt not to affirm, Did Chriſtians ſet in earneſt to their work, and labour to improve *Abrahams Covenant*, and their *Infant-Baptiſm*, they ſhould find as much profit, advantage, and ſupport to their Souls, as any *Anabaptiſts* do by their *Dipping* when Adult. But if Ordinances be not improved, how can Men expect any good by them?

When God made that *Covenant* with *Abraham*, to be the God of him and his Seed, and appointed the ſeal of his *Covenant* to be Adminiſtred to the *Infant* on the eigth day. Might not? ought not *all* the *Jews*, and did not many of them when they came to years of diſcretion, and were taught the meaning of them, improve them to their Souls advantage? why then may not we as well improve the ſame *Covenant*, and our *Infant-Baptiſm*, when we are come to years of diſcretion, to our Spititual advantage, when

when we understand them by our Pastors and Parents teaching?

If there be such an advantage in *Adult-Baptism*, over there is in *Infant-Baptism*, what is the matter that some of them could say, they found no such good by it? and I do believe them by their Conversation; but especially, what is the reason that so many hundreds of them cast off both *Infant* and *Adult-Baptism*, and deny *Baptism* altogether, for which they were sometime so zealous? if there had been such advantage in it, they would not have done so wickedly to cast away such an Institution of Christ.

*Secondly*, A second thing which might occasion this, is, That so many Children of Godly Parents, who were Dedicated to God in *Baptism* in their Infancy, and Parents have bestowed great pains in their Education, yet prove wicked.

The deeper the wounds of such Parents, and the sorer the damnation of such Children without Repentance.

But first, We may observe the greatest number of visible, yea true Christians in the visible Church, consist of the Children of such Parents.

Since the Flood of Iniquity of late years brake in upon this Nation, it hath risen so high that it hath flown into the Houses of God-

Godly Parents, more than ever it did ſince *England* knew the Goſpel. This is a Lamentation.

*Secondly*, Was it not ſo in *Iſaac*'s Family, where but two, and one naught.

*Thridly*, We never underſtood that when God made that *Covenant* with our *Father Abraham*, and his Seed, that he intended to make all his Seed Godly; but we underſtand ſuch a Priviledge in it, that neither Parents nor Children, who have their Eyes opened, will part with it, let the *Anabaptiſts* write what they pleaſe againſt it.

*Fourthly*, But do this *Diſjing*, and *Re-Baptiſing* of Adult perſons help it? are they all Godly? If the Elect and Regenerate be the only Subjects of *Babtiſm*, [as my Author tells me] I am ſure they are not of *Anabaptiſm*, to my knowledge, unleſs drunkenneſs and uncleanneſs, be Notes of Regeneration; we ſhall not need to go to *Germany* to inquire, *England* will afford proof enough. Mr. *Baxter* hath given us a ſad account of ſome of them, enough to make a ſerious Chriſtian afraid of the Opinion. By a ſerious Chriſtian who came from *New-England*, we are informed, That a [*Sea-man*

*None deny that Regenerate perſons are the ſubjects of Baptiſm, he muſt ſay only, elſe he oppoſed not us Chriſtins Scrip. pract. of Int. &c. p. 147, 148.*

as

as I remember] one being Baptiſed, how long the *Baptiſt* held him under Water I know not, but ſo ſoon as his Head was above Water, he wrapt out an Oath [ſo I heard it] *what do yon make account to drown me ?*

*Thirdly*, Another is this, The great Adverſary of Chriſt and his Church, ſeeing how earneſtly the Spirits of good Chriſtians were ſet for the Reformation of the Church in all Points, according to the Holy Scriptures which we profeſs, to hinder this work, by dividing of Chriſtians, and raiſing Animoſities one againſt another, uſed this for one Engine. Baptiſing of Infants of Beleiving Parents, being the Opinion and Practiſe of ſuch Chriſtians, they muſt now be thrown by, becauſe in the Scriptures we can no where read that Chriſt gave command to his Apoſtles to Baptiſe Infants. While I was anſwering this Book, word was ſent me, That there was one who would Diſpute with me in the Congregation, expecting his coming, and knowing he had thrown away *Water-Baptiſm*; for an Introduction to my work, I laid down Ten Arguments to prove that *Water-Baptiſm* was ſtill an Inſtitution of Chriſt, obliging all that profeſſed Faith in him, to practiſe, to hear what he would ſay to them, judging it a ſilly act in him, to

come

come to oppoſe me in *Infant-Baptiſm*, who had renounced *Water-Baptiſm* altogether: but that day which he ſaid he would come, he did not. About three Weeks after he did, and this was all he had againſt me [what concerned others I regard not] *Where did Chriſt give command to Baptiſe Infants?* To this I had ſpoken ſeveral times before, that this was no New thing to the Congregation. There was no ſuch expreſs command in thoſe words I granted, but there was a command to Baptiſe Infants, implyed, included in that command of Chriſt to his Apoſtles, to Baptiſe Diſciples, *Matth.*28. 19. I framed my Argument, but the Man could not tell which Propoſition to deny: but after ſome words [litele to the purpoſe] civilly departed.

They who deſire the Reformation of the Church, do not ſay every thing muſt be expreſly ſet down in Scripture; but if it be contained in the Scripture, and by neceſſary conſequence deducted from thence, we are bound to believe, or practiſe it.

Our Lord taught us this in proving the Reſurrection againſt the *Sadduces*; A Point of infinite more conſequence, then the Baptiſing of an Infant. For if there be no Reſurrection, to what purpoſe is our Religion? But according to the *Anabaptiſts* Argument,

that

that Call for an expreſs command to baptiſe Infants, and therefore reject it, our Lord did not prove the Reſurrection.

I will perſonate a *Sadducee*, and take their Argument; the Queſtion is, *Shall there be a Reſurrection of the Dead?* The *Sadducee* denies it, our Lord affirms it, and proves it from *Exod.* 3. 6. *I am the God of Abraham*, &c. *Matth.* 22. 29. 31. *v.* But what is this to the proof of the Queſtion, *Doth God ſay expreſly to Moſes, there ſhall be a Reſurrection of the Dead?* if ſo, then we will *believe* it, elſe not. Thus the *Anabaptiſt*, *Doth Chriſt expreſly command the Apoſtles to Baptiſe Infants?* then we will *Practiſe* it, elſe we Condemn it. But tho' God did not expreſly ſay there ſhall be a Reſurrection, yet he ſaid that, which by neceſſary Conſequence will force it. For tho' *Jacob*, who died laſt of the three, had been dead two hundred years, when God ſpake thoſe words, yet he ſaith, he is their God, *but he is not the God of the dead, but of the living*, Mark 12. 28. The people ſaid, *He anſwer'd them well*, and 22 Matth. 33. *They were aſtoniſhed at it*. Yet I may ſay, the neceſſity of this Conſequence, from that Antecedent, is nothing ſo obvious and clear to many, even good Chriſtians, as the Conſequence of Infants of Believing-Parents, being under *Abrahams Co-*

*venant*

*venant*, and Church-Members with their Parents. But what mischief this Principle and Practice hath done, and how it hath served the Devils Design, we are sad Witnesses.

*Fourthly*, Tho' I do not put so much stress upon this, because the Argument of the *Anabaptist* cast out all the Posterity of the soundest Believers, and holy Men, as well as the most wicked out of the Church; yet I believe this hath helped on with the rest, to see what ignorant and debauched persons [because it is the Mode of the Nation] require Baptism for their Children, and it is Administred to them. The *Anabaptists* Principle is, *That Regenerate Persons are the only Subject of Baptism*, but how far is this Practice from their Principle? This doth a little confirm me in it; because that Man whom I mentioned in my first *Page*, with whom we held Communion; when those who are esteemed godly, and he did think so, had Children to be baptized, he desired he might know it, and would be present at the Administration, though he was not clear for *Infant-Baptism*.

This I will say, I had rather baptize the Children of some *Heathen*, than of many who are called *Christians*, their *Ignorance* is not more, nor *Conversations* worse, and yet these *Christians* have lived long under Gos-

pel

pel-light: Had they but the knowledge required in the *Catechiſm* in the *Common-Prayer-book*, and Converſations as civil as ſome *Indians* I have known, it were tolerable; but when men are asked,

Queſt. *What is God?*

*Anſ.* A good old man.

Qu. *What is Jeſus Chriſt?*

*Anſ.* A courteous young Gentleman.

Queſt. *How many Gods are there?*

*Anſ.* Ten.

Qu. *How many Commandments are there?*

*Anſ.* Two.

Qu. *Which is the firſt?*

*Anſ.* Salvation.

What the ſecond was he forgot that ſtood by, and ſhewed the three laſt Queſtions, [the firſt two were another perſon's] and profeſſed to my Father-in-law, when he came to have his Child baptized, That he anſwered him as well as he could. For want of Catechiſing and good Diſcipline in Church and State: Into what a miſerable condition is this Nation fallen? That this hath helped on among theſe who are godly *Anabaptiſts*, I do not much doubt.

*Fifthly*, I cannot exclude the holy and juſt government of God. When people come to be glutted with the precious Goſpel-truths, the life of a Chriſtian; theſe are ſtale

ſtale and common; *new things* would be welcome. I doubt not to ſay, God may permit ſome of his own dear people to fall into ſome Errour, which in them he overlooks and pardons: when others ſhall take up that Errour, and bear up themſelves in it, becauſe ſuch godly men were of that Opinion, and that Errour to them, ſhall be an inlet to other Errours, and ſo fall from one to another, filling their heads with notions, and ſpending time in diſpute about ſlight matters, and ruine their Souls at laſt. I thought it was a ſmart and terrible ſpeech of *Tertullian*, *Nec periclitor dicere*, &c. *Nor do I think it any danger to ſay, The very Scriptures themſelves to be ſo ordered or diſpoſed by the will of God, that they ſhould miniſter matter to Hereticks, when I read there muſt be Hereſie*, 1 Cor. 11. 19. *which without the Scriptures could not be.* De prescrip. adv. Hæret. p. 86.

And here I cannot but obſerve the judgment of God [I can call it no other] That two great Corporations I know, where there were great Aſſemblies of *Anabaptiſts*, [It is the ſame in many other places in *England*] the greateſt number of them turned *Quakers*, the *Anabaptiſts* Society dwindle almoſt to nothing. Thus they who threw off *Infant-Baptiſm*, throw off

the *Ordinance* of *Baptiſm* it ſelf, *the Lord's Supper*, and the great Goſpel-truth, ſetting up *Self*, and *a Heatheniſh morality*, being now fallen into the *Mare mortuum*, from which few or none return.

*Sixthly*, Another thing which hath prevailed to draw away ſome honeſt meaning perſons, not able to judge, have been, the great ſtreſs and abſolute neceſſity the *Anabaptiſts* put upon *Baptiſm*, and *their Baptiſm*, for ſo they ſtyle themſelves *the Baptized Congregations*, and none baptized but themſelves, which ſtrikes divers good Chriſtians with fear; and what great good things they may expect who do come into their way, being Rebaptized, from *Mark* 16. This Text *Peter de Bruis a Waldenſian* [ in great eſteem with my Author, for his judgment againſt *Infant-Baptiſm*; though herein, as in other things charged upon him, by his railing *Popiſh Adverſary*, who took them up by Report from others, he confeſſeth, it is thought he is abuſed, ] makes great uſe of, and tells us, *Not one of theſe alone doth ſave, but joyntly; not Baptiſm without our own proper Faith; nor our own proper Faith without Baptiſm, is able to do any thing; neither of them without the other ſaveth. Therefore though Infants be*

*neutrum enim ſine alteo ſalvat.*

*be baptized by you, yet because by the hinderance of their, they cannot believe, by no means are they saved.* With other strange Tenets, not worthy the Transcribing. If my Author be not of the same Opinion with this *De Bran*, [if he be not abused] why doth he so much glory of him in his Book, and in his *Title-page?* And if this be true, *That sound Faith in Christ cannot save without persons be of age, and Dowzed over Head and Ears*; no wonder though they who believe it, yield to *Dipping*.

I intend not to meddle with the *Opinion*, only this I say, *They who do believe Jesus Christ to be God-man in one Person truly Immanuel, do reverence the Institution of Christ, and do acknowledge a necessity of the Ordinance*, both a *Necessitas modii & præcepti*, nor dare we omit it: Yea, some of the *Socinians*, [which I note because of the *Quaquers*, some of which I know to be rather worse than *Socinians*, as to the Person of Christ, and deny *Baptism* altogether; as also the *Lord's Supper*, and no wonder] do acknowledge *Baptism* not to be a thing indifferent, but necessary, as *Martin. Crechonicius*, and a *means of Salvation*, as *Schlichtingius*, *That no man is to be esteemed a Member of the Church of Christ without Baptism*, as *Ostorodus*. Therefore he thinks,

Socin. Proflig. de Baptiſ.

and *Socinus*, *That Infants may be baptized.* All quoted with the Pages of their Books, by *Calonius*; and tells us alſo, *That in a Socinian Synod*, held *Anno* 1636. in *Tranſilvania*, [as I underſtand it was] the *Synod* concluded for *Water-bapiſm*, *In the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt.* So that the *Quaker* as to *Goſpel Ordinances*, and other greateſt *Goſpel-truths*, are the worſt Enemies Chriſt hath among them who own the *Goſpel*, which they do after a faſhion.

*The neceſſity of Baptiſm, both for the* Adult *and* little children, *but not* abſolute neneſſity.

But though we own the *Neceſſity of Baptiſm*, yet we do not think a ſound Believer in Chriſt dying without *Baptiſm*, ſhall be damned: Our Lord doth not ſay in the next words *Mark* 16. 16. *but he that believeth not, nor is baptized, ſhall be damned.* Sound Believers may be hindred from *Baptiſm*, and have been ſo.

How the Hopes of *ſpiritual advantage*, as to more *Grace* and *ſenſe of God's Love.* Upon the *Suaſions* ſome *Sectaries* have uſed to draw honeſt perſons into their way, have prevailed, and how miſerably they have complained after of *Diſappointment*, I could give Inſtance.

The Learned *Reignolds Præter.* 3. *de Lib. Apoc.*

*Apoc.* doth assert, with many others whom he mentions.

I can also instance one Woman reputed for a serious Christian, who hearing an *Anabaptist*, and after discoursing with him, he told her, she must unravel all again, she wanted this Ordinance of *Baptism*, put her into such a fright, that the Woman could not be quiet in her mind till she was Dipped, and then fell distracted, and never recovered. I had this from her own relation. The *Spaniards* drive the *Indians* to Baptism; and the *Anabaptists*, scarce sound Christians, baptized to *Anabaptism*.

I wrote to an Acquaintance of mine in a Corporation where were many *Anabaptists*, to certifie me about the Conversation of *Anabaptists*. He answers me, they are mouldered away to nothing, most turn *Quakers*. Two that lived the next door to him were the best he knew. The Woman, when *Dipt*, thought she was in a state of Salvation, [as she said] but threw off that, all Ordinances and Prayer. He, a little before his Death, slighted the Blood of Christ, and both died *Quakers*; yet by their carriage drew divers to be *Quakers*.

## SECT. II.

As to the Book it ſelf, who ever was the Author, I charged it with falſhood in the Hiſtorical part: When I ſent to borrow it again, a ſecond Edition was ſent me, then I ſaw the Letter was true, which aſſured me Colonel *Danvers* was the Author; and abundance of Authors more added than were in the firſt: A whole Regiment is drawn up, to the admiration of the Ignorant *Anabaptiſts* that now cry *Victoria*, if he doth not abuſe his Authors, and the *Anabaptiſts* too, which he hath moſt groſly.

For the ancient Fathers, ſeveral of them I had read, and knew them to be contrary to his Opinion: But to follow Authors in particular, I thought it a vain thing on the *Lords-Day*, and that in a Country Congregation. His quoting of the old *Britains*, and the *Waldenſes*, as being Enemies to *Infant-Baptiſm*, I took notice of, anſwered that and no more. Of which a little afterwards.

As to the numerous company of Authors he hath quoted, I ſhall ſay but two things.

*Firſt*, I deſire my Author to tell us if amongſt them all he can find, who was the Author of *Infant-Baptiſm*, if it be an Errour; as we can tell him who firſt oppo-

ſed

ſed *Infant-Baptiſm*, Hereticks not of the lower rank.

The *Lord Brooks*, is a perſon whom the *Anabaptiſts* would perſwade us, was one of their *Sect*, becauſe of ſome Lines of his, with which I accord: But he tells us what prevailed with him on the contrary; his words are theſe.

*For ought I could ever learn, it was the conſtant cuſtom of the pureſt and moſt primitive Church,* [mark Sir, not myſtical *Babylon* then] *to baptize the Infants of believing Parents: For I could never find the beginning and firſt Riſe of this Practice; whereas it is very eaſie to tract Hereſies to their firſt riſing up and ſeting foot in the Church.*

This agrees with what I am upon, why then do you quote him as if he were *yours*? As for what he ſaith about *Schiſmaticks*, Sir, you are the *Schiſmatick*, for I have kept Communion with a godly *Anabaptiſt*; but one tells me, that he deſired Communion with one of your Churches, but they would not admit him to Communion, becauſe he would not be dipped.

I ſee my Author hath named Maſter *D. Rogers*, as if he did favour his Opinion, when as living in the next Town to him, and having intimate acquaintance with him, I knew him to be a ſmart Enemy to the *Anabaptiſts*. The

2. The ſecond thing I would ſay to them, is this, That ancient Father, pious, humble, and learned *Auſtin* flouriſhed above twelve hundred years before my Author, or any *Anabaptiſt* in *England* was born; then he lived ſo many years nearer the Primitive Churches, than my Author, or any of our *Anabaptiſts*: Whether then *B. Auſtin*, or thoſe *Anabaptiſts* ſhould beſt know the practice of the Primitive Churches as to Baptizing of Infants, let any ſober man judge: He being a perſon ſo learned and ſo famous, no queſtion had all thoſe Authors which my Author quotes, that wrote before him, if not many more which we have not: And did not that learned pious Father underſtand them as well as my Author, or any *Anabaptiſt* now in *England?* And though he was no Chriſtian himſelf, yet was not he acquainted with the practice of the *Greek Churches* in his time better than our *Anabaptiſts?* Now he ſaith, the practice of *Infant-baptiſm* was ſo univerſal in the Church, that it could not but come from the Apoſtles. *Eccleſia ſemper habuit, &c.* The *Church* ever heard it, ſaith he.

*Auſtin.* l. 1. *de peccat. mer. & reniſ. c.* 26. *De baptiſ. contra. Denat.* l. 2. c. 7. & l. 4. c. 24.

Had not *Auſtin* ſpoke true, there was one did watch him [*Pelagius*] who

who would have told him of it to purpose, for that Practice ſtood in *Pelagius*'s way, but *Pelagius* did not deny it.

And whereas my Author doth not regard the Writers as to this Controverſie, that wrote after the Third *Centuary*; I am very confident there is no Author that wrote in the three firſt *Centuaries*, that have any thing in them to oppoſe the baptizing of the Infants of believing Parents; but on the contrary, ſome of them ſpeak for it.

They that read the moſt ancient Writers next the Apoſtles, may ſee the ſubject matter they treated upon, did not give them any occaſion to ſpeak of *Infant-Baptiſm*, they had other Points in hand.

As to the old *Britains*, I was a little ſtartled to read them brought againſt *Infant-Baptiſm*, the Proof my Author brings out of *Fabianus*, I did read in him, but I much queſtion the truth of *Fabianus*, becauſe Mr. *Fox*, giving us an account what *Auſtin* the Monk required of the *Britiſh* Biſhops when he came into *England*; tells us, 'He re-" quired that they ſhould Preach the Goſ-" pel to the *Engliſh-men*, and that they " ſhould among themſelves reform certain " Rites and uſages in their Church, ſpe-" cially for keeping *Eaſtertide*, and Bapti-" zing after the manner of *Rome*.

Mr.

Mr. *Fox* quotes ſeveral Authors beſides *Fabianus*, for this: But that paſſage, *That they ſhould give Chriſtendom to children*, which *Fabianus* reports, he doth not mention.

To Baptize after the manner of *Rome*, to uſe their Ceremonies in Baptiſm, and to baptize Children; differ much. I ſearched what Ceremonies were then uſed in *Rome* in *Gregory*'s time, and no wonder though the *Britiſh* Biſhops rejected them.

But that the old *Britains* were againſt *Infant-Baptiſm*, is very falſe, wch I thus prove.

What year God firſt ſent the Goſpel into *England*, the Learned do not agree; there ſeem to be ſtrong grounds to believe, that it was before King *Lucius* ſent to *Eleutherius* B. of *Rome*; ſome ſay it was, *An.* 156, others 169, others 170, others 180. The Conteſt between *Auſtin* and *Pelagius*, was about 417, in the 63 year of *Auſtins* life, as *Bucolcerus* gathers. *Pelagius* denied Original Sin; upon that denied Infant-Baptiſm as being ſuperfluous: not becauſe Infants cannot believe, which is the ſole Argument of our *Anabaptiſts*, *Pelagius* a learned man would have ſlighted ſuch an Argument as this. *Auſtin* proves Infants to be guilty of Original Sin, from the univerſal practice of the Church to take away Original Sin, they did baptize Infants: Now this Infant-

baptiſm

baptiſm, ſaith *Auſtin*, *The Church ever had it, ever held it, they received this from the faith of their Anceſtors, and this will it keep with perſeverance to the end.* Let *Pelagius* who was a *Britain*, anſwer this: *Britany* had received the Goſpel 240 years before this Conteſt. *Pelagius* knew the practice of his own Country, and if it had been true, that the old *Britains* did not baptize Infants, as my Author ſaith, why did not *Pelagius* Confute *Auſtin*, charge him with falſhood; the *Britains* do not baptize Infants, *ergo*, it is not the practice of the Univerſal Church: This being an Argument *Auſtin* did ſo urge, aud put ſo much ſtreſs upon it, *Pelagius* would have removed it if he could. *De verb. Apo. Ser. 10.*

But ſo far was *Pelagius* and his followers from denying what *Auſtin* affirmed, that *Celeſtius* a *Pelagian*, in a Book which he put forth at *Rome*, hath theſe words, which *Auſtin* quotes out of it; *We do confeſs that Infants ought to be baptized for remiſſion of ſins, according to the rule of the Univerſal Church, and according to the ſentence of the Goſpel,* though *Cæleſtius* do not mention the Text, yet by the following words, we may plainly ſee he means, *John* 3. 5. *Except a man be born again of Water and of the Spirit.* So that according

according to this *Pelagian*, here is *Scripture ground*, and the *Rule of the Universal Church for Infant-Baptism.*

So then for the old *Britains*, they were not against *Infant-baptism :* Now then for the *Waldenses*, were I to charge any Opinion or practice upon other Churches, I should first look to the Confession of their Faith, then I may boldly charge them or not. As we have a few Anabaptistical Writers in *England*, should their Books a hundred years hence fall into the hands of Anabaptists in foreign parts, should they then affirm that the Church of *England*, [or the Churches in *England*] were *Anabaptists*, would not this be false, and take it as a wrong done unto us? View the Confession of Faith of the Church of *England*, of the Assembly of Divines, of the Independents in *England*, in *New England*, all their Confessions declare for *Infant-baptism.* Thus should my Author have done, if he would deal honestly with the *Waldenses*, produce their Confession of Faith, and the Article in which they condemn *Infant-baptism.* In the Articles which I have read over, I find no such thing, but that *Baptism ought to be Administred only with pure Water, without any mixture of hallowed Oyl.*

The

The Miniſters in the *Vallies of Piemont*, in the year 1532, when the Anabaptiſts in *Germany* were riſen up, in the 17th Article of their Confeſſion, declare for Infant-baptiſm: The Churches in thoſe Vallies, kept chaſte to Chriſt from the Apoſtles times, and were long before the *Waldenſes* were named; they were called *Waldenſes*, bnt this was a Nick-name put upon them by their Adverſaries, to make the World believe, that their Religion was but a Novelty. [*Morland.p.*12.]

In the Confeſſion of the Faith of the *Waldenſes* in *Bohemia*, (ſo *Vergerius* three times calls them) the 12th Article Declares for Infant-baptiſm, *Anno* 1535. As the Anabaptiſts roſe up, ſo the Churches drew up their Confeſſions againſt them: The Miniſters in their Preface to their Confeſſion, write, "That ſome malicious Spirits, be-
"cauſe they would caſt all the *Odium* up-
"on them that they could, did reckon
"them amongſt the Anabaptiſts. But they
"anſwer, *Nos ex factione Anabaptiſtarum*
"*non eſſe, nemini ignotum eſt.* All men know
"they were none of that *Faction*, nor had
"any thing to do with the Anabaptiſts. The
"Doctrine they confeſſed in their Church-
"es, they held and owned, before the
"name of the Anabaptiſts was ſo much as
"heard of. So

So that my Author hath plainly abuſed both the old *Britains*, and the *Waldenſes*.

Obſerving how my Author and Mr. *Tombs* inſulted over Mr. *Baxter*, and he that gave me the Challenge to Print, telling me, *All my Party were ſilent*, and I living in a Country ſmall Town, and not hearing what Books came forth, I could not tell what to think of it; but when I wrote my Copy for the Preſs, I left here a ſpace, till I wrote to Mr. *Baxter*, to know whether he had met with any Arguments to change his thought. I thank him, he ſent me down his Book in anſwer to them both. Then one lent me Mr. *Wills*. I heard alſo of Mr. *Whitſton*, but I ſaw none of theſe Authors till my Copy was written, but I ſee they have anſwered Mr. *Danvers* to purpoſe, diſcovered his groſs falſhood and forgery. Another Divine I met with that knows Mr. *Danvers*, though he hath not written againſt him, yet he hath ſo traced him, that he told me, never did *Jeſuites* abuſe Authors in their *Quotations*, more than he hath done.

That the *Jeſuites* practice lies this way, we may ſee in *Bellarmine*, who quotes *Ten* of the Fathers to juſtifie his Doctrine of *Chriſts preaching to the Spirits in priſon*, 1 Pet. 3. 19. when as *Six* of them (I may ſay

ſay, *Eight* of them) give that Interpretation of the Text, which *Bellarmine* himſelf condemns. See (ſaith that pious and learned *Reignolds*) *With what Conſcience theſe Jeſuites handle the Controverſies of Religion*; which may well be applyed to Mr. *Danvers*, abuſing ſo many Authors as he hath done. [*Reignold. Prælec.* 86. *de lib. Apochr. p.* 1044. *See him again, p.* 1083.]

## SECTION III.

Leaving then the Hiſtorical part, by which Infant-baptiſm is much confirmed: Let us come to the holy Scriptures, out of which our Divines who have laboured in this Controverſie, have produced ſo many, that I know not how more can be well added; where therefore others have been large, I will be brief.

One man I knew (though I had no inward acquaintance with him) about fifty years ſince, a Mechanick, and Head of a ſeparate Company in thoſe days; he had none but his *Mother-tongue*, but a very good head in *Polemical Divinity*. This Doctrine of *Anti-pædobaptiſm* then being propounded to him, he rejected, though he had other Arguments againſt it, yet I took notice of this: *I obſerve* (ſaith he) *ever ſince God had a people upon the earth, he made a dif-*

*difference between the families of his ſervants, and of wicked men, even before the flood*, Gen. 6.2. There is not only *truth*, but *ſtrength* in it, what-ever the Anabaptiſts ſcribble againſt it.

Two Texts eſpecially my Author pitch upon, becauſe he thinks we build much upon them; *Gen.*17. 7. & 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. and ſo we do: theſe he labours to take from us. That the children of the *Jews* were Church-members with their Parents, the Anabaptiſts acknowledge: Then they were made ſo, by this Covenant of God with *Abraham* and with his Seed, and the Commandment to Circumciſe them; here then we muſt begin.

From the 17. *Gen.*7. I lay the Argument thus.

A gracious Covenant made, ſigned, and ſealed by God, with a believing Perſon and his Seed, and never repealed by God; that Covenant remaineth in force, and is to be ſigned and ſealed unto his Seed.

But that Covenant of God with *Abraham*( to be his God, and the God of his Seed, was ſuch a Covenant, and never repealed, *Therefore*

This we premiſe, There is a great difference between the outward Adminiſtration of an Ordinance, and the inward Efficacy? This is clear in the *Lords Supper*, preach-

preaching the Word, and ſo in *Baptiſm*; the Scripture is plain for this, and the Anabaptiſts cannot deny it.

Or, if you pleaſe to take Mr. *Tho. Hooker*'s diſtinction, There is an *Inward* and an *Outward* Covenant. [*Cov. of Grace, p.* 2. 3.]

*Inward*, ſtanding in a ſpiritual Inſtitution of it between God and man.

When God calls a people, and with his Call gives them Faith to anſwer his Call: So that now he is indeed their God, becomes theirs by Faith, and they who are thus in Covenant with him ſhall never fall.

2ly, The outward Covenant is more large; The Diſpenſation of this God gives on his part to Chriſtians, and their Engagements on their part, is Faith in him, ſubjection to him: He doth engage himſelf to them, and if they anſwer the outward Priviledge, he will make them a choice people, *Exod.* 19. 5. *Deut.* 26. 17, 18, *&c.* too long to tranſcribe.

By vertue of this Covenant, God was ſaid, *To know them above all the Nations in the world*, Amos 3. 2. God ſet up *his Tabernacle amongſt them, and dwelt amongſt them*, Exod. 25. 8. Pſal. 135. 1. *Choſe Iſrael for his peculiar treaſure*, Pſal. 135. 4. *Gave them his Ordinances*, Pſal. 147. 19, 20. God wrought for them wonderfully; and though they

provoked him exceedingly, yet he bare with them, and did not *for* Abraham's *sake cast them out of his presence as yet*, 2 King. 13. 23. Thus was he a *God* to them, the whole visible Church of the *Jews*; by it God gave them a great advantage to lay hold upon God, to become their God, in an *outward Covenant*, in Efficacy, as well as in outward Administration: This I say, by vertue of this *Covenant* with *Abraham*, till they dealt most wickedly with God in Covenant, rejecting Christ, the promised Seed in *Abraham's* Covenant, in whom they should be blessed; then God brake Covenant with them, and cast them off, *Zech.* 11. 10, 14.

As a people may be said to be Gods people, so God their God.

1. When they acknowledge God to be the onely true God, and their God.

2. When they worship him with his own Worship onely.

3. When they profess his Truths, Doctrines, and take his Word for their Rule.

4. When they do Covenant and engage themselves to God. Yet among these may be many Hypocrites, and but formal Christians; as *Branches are said to be in Christ*, John 15. 2.

My Author moves six Questions here

to

to raiſe a duſt, and trouble the Reader, when things are plain; he might have reduced them to Three, what is conſiderable in the reſt I ſhall touch.

*Firſt*, I call it a *Gracious Covenant*: We read of ſeveral Promiſes God made to *Abraham*, Gen. 12. 2, 3, 7. and *Chap.* 13, 14, 15, 16. and *Chap.* 15. 1, 4, 5. But the word *Covenant* we read not of till this 17th *Chapter*, here we have it ſeveral times: and this Covenant between *Abraham* and his Seed, being the laſt branch of the Covenant [for *Canaan* in the next Verſe, was promiſed three times before] God now adds a Sign, *verſe* 11. which the Apoſtle calls a Seal, *Rom.* 4. 11. So that now all the former Promiſes, God binds them up, and ſeals them up in a Covenant. The great Promiſe of all *Chap.* 12. 3. *In thy Seed ſhall all the Nations be bleſſed*, is not mentioned in this Chapter, ſince God began to ſpeak of a Covenant; but this was a part of the Covenant, the Apoſtle *Peter* tells the *Jews*, *Acts* 3. 25. *Ye are the Children of the Covenant which God made with our Fathers, ſaying to* Abraham, *And in thy Seed ſhall all the Kindreds of the earth be bleſſed.*

Hence that this was a Covenant of Grace, no man can rationally deny. The Apoſtle is ſo clear for it in *Rom.* 4. and *Gal.* 3.

1. How can God after the breach of the first Covenant, now Covenant with any to be their God, but by a Covenant of Grace?

2. A Covenant in which Christ is promised, and it is confirmed in Christ, *Galat.* 3. 17.

3. A Covenant wherein God preacheth the Gospel to *Abraham*, Gal. 3.8.

4. A Covenant, the Righteousness whereof is the Righteousness of Faith, *Rom.* 4.11.

5. A Covenant made 430 years, before the Covenant at Mount *Sinai*, which *Sinai* Covenant could not disanul, *Galat.* 3.17.

Our Divines have cleared this so, that I say no more of it; and therefore being *confirmed in Christ*, it must be the same with the new Covenant. But as Christ was first revealed but obscurely in a *promised Seed*, but afterwards by the Prophets there was a clearer revealing of Christ the nearer the time this Son of Righteousness should rise: So the new Covenant was comprehended in this Covenant made with *Abraham*, but by the Prophets afterwards God revealed it more fully, after the *Jews* had so violated the Mount *Sinai*-Covenant. Hence that which Divines call the *Anima fœderis*, the Soul of the Covenant, *I will be their God*, was also in *Abraham*'s Covenant.

My

My Author denies that *Abraham*'s Covenant and the new Covenant are the ſame; he tells us, *it was a mixed Covenant; there were two Seeds, and ſo Promiſes, and of two ſorts, which muſt be applyed right to the two Seeds.*

*Anſ.* 1. How many Covenants ſhall we have in the Bible, by this Author? *Camero* is blamed by ſome Divines for making Three Covenants, but by this Author we ſhall have Four. 1. *Adam*'s Covenant, or Covenant of Nature; 2. *Abraham*'s Covenant; 3. The *Iſraelites* Covenant at *Mount Sinai*; 4. The *New Covenant.*

2. Are there not outward Promiſes alſo annexed to the *New Covenant*, as well as to *Abraham*'s? Do we not read them plainly?

3. Are there not two Seeds in your Adminiſtration of Baptiſm, to *Adult Perſons* by Dipping; *Real*, and *Formal?* I am ſure they are not all *Real Chriſtians*; and do not your Baptiſm belong to the *New Covenant*, a Sign and Seal of the Grace threof? Yet this you Adminiſter to ſuch, as prove Notorious *Hypocrites.*

4. Did not *Abraham*'s Seed by this mixed Covenant, enjoy beſides outward Corporal Bleſſings, thoſe Bleſſings I mentioned before, in the Church, with more I might have mentioned?

5. Did not God engage himſelf to be the God of all the Seed? and did not *Circumciſion* Seal up his Covenant and Engagement to them, if they did perform the Condition? and had they not a great advantage by God's engaging himſelf thus to them to lay hold upon God, for their God and Eternal Portion?

2*ly*, *This Covenant was made with* Abraham *as a Believing Perſon, and the Father of Believers*; it was not made with him as a *Man*, nor with his Seed as *Men*, but as the Seed of a *Believing Father*. *Circumciſion was the Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith.* Rom. 4. 11. in which Chapter twice he is called, *The Father of all Believers*, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*; and *Gal.* 3. 29.

Here a Queſtion might be moved, why *Abraham* ſhould be called, *The Father of Believers*; my Reaſon is, were there no *Believers* before *Abraham?* was he the Firſt and Eldeſt *Believer?* The Father in the Family is the firſt in the Family; ſo *Abraham*, if the Father, ſhould be the firſt. But was not *Abel* a *Believer* in *Chriſt*, *Enoch*, *Noah*, &c. ſurely there were *Believers* in *Chriſt* a Thouſand Years before *Abraham* was Born, what may we think of *Adam* and *Eve* in Charity, may we not think they Believed

in

in the Promiſed Seed? why then ſhould *Abraham* be the *Father?*

*Aquinas* Anſwering to a Queſtion, *Why Circumciſion was commanded firſt to* Abraham, *and to none before?* [*Serm. Doct.* 3. *q.* 70. *Act.* 2.] Anſwers, *That* Abraham *was the firſt that received the Promiſe from God of Chriſt to be born out of his Seed, and the firſt that ſeperated himſelf from the Society of Infidels.* If this were true, it would ſerve to Anſwer our Queſtion. Tho' *A Lapide* labours to defend the Vulgar Tranſaction, *Gen.* 3. 15. *She ſhall bruiſe thy Head*; yet he ſaith it come all to one. *For it is the Woman by her Seed, that is Chriſt, that bruiſed the Serpents Head*; Do we think the Lord did not teach his Servants then the uſe and end of the Sacrifices? So that Chriſt was promiſed before, and there were Believers before, if there were a little more revealing of Chriſt to *Abraham* now, that is all. I do more admire his Act in ſacrificing his Son *Iſaac*, though that is given to his *fear of God*, Gen. 22. 12.

I cannot think of any better reaſon than this, though there were Believers in Chriſt, and *Abraham* might be a ſtronger Believer, but with none did God make an expreſs Covenant, *a Believer and his Seed*, and ſeal the Covenant to his Poſterity, but with *Abraham* only.

I ſhall add a few more words preſently.

3. *This Covenant was made alſo with, and ſealed to his Seed.*

The great Queſtion is, who are this *Seed?* my Author tells me, His *Spiritual Seed:* Whence I meet with this once and again, That *Abraham's* natural Seed was a Type of the ſpiritual Seed; Elect, Regenerate. Thus in anſwer to the queſtion, *Whether not baptizing Infants makes not the Priviledge under the Goſpel, leſs than under the Law?* He anſwers, *The natual Seed of* Abraham *was a typical ſhadowing thing—— as the Antitype exceeds the Type, the ſpiritual birth the carnal birth; ſo much are we better.*

*Anſ.* 1. What do you mean by, *ſo much are we better?* Were none of theſe who were Circumciſed being *Abraham's* natural Seed, alſo his ſpiritual Seed? Your words carried it as if not. Beſides here would be a queſtion, *How the Elect-regenerate, the ſpiritual Seed, are* Abraham's *Seed; how is he a Father to them, as ſuch?* I am ſure they are *Chriſt's Seed*, Iſa. 53. 10, 11. And we can give reaſons, why they ſhould be called *his Seed.* he is the *meritorious* and *efficient cauſe* of them, but *Abraham neither way:* You would have done well to have ſhewn us this. *Abraham* is not ſo much a

Father,

Father to us, as *Paul* was to the *Corinthians*, 1 Cor. 4. 15. neither I am ſure in this reſpect he was Father to *Iſaac*, he did not convey Faith in his Generation of *Iſaac*; how then is he a Father to us now? That there were Believers before *Abraham*, the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 11. 4, 5, 7. Inſtance in *Abel*, *Enoch*, and *Noah*; (and more I doubt not) but yet in the Hiſtory written by *Moſes*, *Abraham* is the firſt perſon who is called a *Believer*, upon a ſpecial Promiſe given to him, *Gen.* 15. 6. if any cauſe, he was but *Cauſa exemplaris*, which is *Cauſa adjuvnans* to the principal: By his example we ſhould be ſtirred up to believe the Promiſe of God, as *Abraham* our Father did; (*a*) but he had ſuch an advantage as we have not: he knew the Promiſe was made to *him* immediately, without any diſcourſe, which we cannot know, but muſt firſt prove the Condition. But this I think alſo is a reaſon, He was the *firſt perſon ſealed*, that received the Seal of that Promiſe or Covenant, and all his Seed after him commanded to receive and obſerve the ſame. This Sign and Seal being *viſible*, I conceive *Abraham* is to be conſidered, as a *viſible-believing Father*, and all his *viſible Seed* muſt be ſealed as the Father.

(a) *An example how God will juſtifie us.*

2. As

2. As to what you say, the *natural Seed* are the Type of the *spiritual Seed*; was not *Isaac* his natural Seed, and was he not also his spiritual Seed; then it seems *Isaac* was a Type of himself. So all the godly *Jews* after, that were *Abraham's* Seed after the flesh, were Types of themselves. I pray tell us how the Type and Anti-type meet in one individual person? To what Topick in Logick will you refer the Type and Anti-type?

2*ly*, When the Anti-type comes, the Type cease: When then *Isaac*, *Jacob*, and the *Israelites*, that are the natural Seed, come to be the Spiritual Seed, then they must cease to be his natural Seed: But how is this possible? When Christ came, the Types ceased.

3*ly*, When you Dip your Regenerate persons; actual Believers you think they are: then they are the Seed of *Abraham* you judge; then *Abraham* is their Father, then God *is their God:* but divers of these are Hypocrites, we know they have proved so, and we shall hear an Anabaptist anon acknowledge it: they professed they took him for their God, and worshipped him, *&c.* while they then lived in your Churches, and did not as yet openly discover themselves; was *God in no sense their God?*

4*ly*, To

4*ly*, To whom Christ is a Head, to them God may be said to be a God: But Christ is the Head of the visible Church, in which are many unsound Members; *Branches in him that bear no fruit*, John 15.2. Then God in some sense is their God, if Christ may in some sense be their Head.

5*ly*, Is there not an external and an internal Adoption? *Rom.* 9.4. to them *pertained the Adoption:* Were they not called *God's children?* Deut. 14.1. Is not God then the God of his children? Do not God say, *They are mine?* Ezek. 16.20,21. and yet is God no way their God?

6*ly*, If the *spiritual Seed* be there onely meant, then all the *Israelites* in the Land of *Canaan* were the *spiritual Seed*; which I answer is false. That they must be so according to your interpretation, the next Verse proves it; *Gen.* 17.7,8,9. At the 8th verse, *I will give unto thee and to thy seed after thee, the Land wherein thou art a stranger, all the Land of* Canaan *for an everlasting possession.* And I will be their God: *Thou shalt therefore keep my Covenant, thou and thy seed after thee in their generations.* Can the Holy One speak plainer than he doth? Doth he not tell you, that that seed of *Abraham* which shall inherit the Land of *Canaan* [where his Tabernacle and all

his

his Instituted Worship was set up ] and there kept the Seal of his Covenant, that he will be *their God?* Doth not God speak the same, *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12, 13. to the men, women and children, who then entred into Covenant with God. *That he may establish thee to day for a people unto himself:* And that he may be a God unto thee, as he hath said unto thee, *and as he hath sworn to thy Fathers*, &c.

When *Peter* would draw the *Jews* to believe in Christ Crucified, who as yet were Unbelievers, and not turned from their iniquities, *Acts* 3. 25, 26. Do he not use this Argument, *You are the children of the Covenant which God made with our Fathers;* Abraham *in thy seed shall all the kinreds of the earth be blessed.* This part of the Covenant was most proper to the thing *Peter* had in hand. But if they were now the children of that Covenant God made with *Abraham*, then God was their God, though as yet they were not a *spiritual seed.*

As to this *Seed* the *Jews* tell us, *The Seed of* Ishmael *is excepted from Circumcision*; as it is written; *For in* Isaac *shall thy seed be called to thee*, Gen 11. 12. *And* Esau *is excepted, for lo,* Isaac *said to* Jacob, *and he give to thee the blessing of* Abraham, *to thee and to thy seed*, Gen. 28. 4. *Ishmael* was cast

out

out of the Church. Profane *Eſau* deſpiſed his Birth-right, and is caſt off.

As to the Sons *Abraham* had by *Keturah*, though the Scripture doth not ſay they they were circumciſed, yet we may rather think they were. But whether after *Abraham* had ſent them away, they kept up Circumciſion in their Families, [*Iſhmael* and *Eſau* kept up Circumciſion we know] and taught their Children the ſpiritual meaning of it, the Scripture is ſilent. So that from them we can draw no Argument *pro* or *con*. This is enough for me, that when God ſaith, *I will ſtabliſh my Covenant between me and thee, and thy ſeed after thee, ——To be a God unto thee, and to thy ſeed after thee*. And the very next words, God promiſeth to give the Land of *Canaan to his ſeed, and will be their God there*. And theſe were the Seed of *Iſaac*, the Seed of *Jacob*; and as the *Martyr Stephen* calls them, *Acts* 7. 38. the Church of God in the Wilderneſs, [that is, *Eccleſia inſtituta, vel organica*, though God might have ſome belong to him that ſprung from the other Sons of *Abraham*.] This is plain and clear, but I am ſure all theſe were not the ſpiritual ſeed.

7*ly*, Elect-regenerate ſtand upon even ground with *Abraham*, but here God puts ſome

ſome honour upon *Abraham*, that his ſeed ſhall have a bleſſing for his ſake.

8*ly*, If Elect-regenerate be only meant by the *Seed*, then there needed not the word *Seed* to be put in, unleſs you will ſay, God is not the God of Elect-regenerate, unleſs they be *Abraham*'s Seed; were he not of *Abel*, *Enoch*, *Noah*, &c.

9*ly*, *This Covenant with* Abraham *and his ſeed was ſigned and ſealed*, Gen. 17. 9, 10, 11, 12. What *Moſes* calls a Sign, or Token the Apoſtle *Rom.* 4. 11. calls a *Seal*.

My Author tells me, *Circumciſion was a Seal to* Abraham *only, not to Believers, nor their ſeed. To Infants it was a ſign put in their fleſh*, &c. too tedious to tranſcribe all.

*A.* You tell us, it ſealed to *Abraham* one the Truth of that Promiſe, *That in his ſeed all the Familes ſhould be bleſſed.* But the ſame Promiſe was made to *Iſaac*, Gen. 26. 4. and to *Jacob*, Gen. 28. 14. Did it not ſeal to them as well? Yea, the Apoſtle *Peter*, Acts 3. 25. tells the *Jews*, they *were children of the Covenant God made with our fathers, ſaying to* Abraham, *And in thy ſeed ſhall all the kindreds of the earth be bleſſed.* Did dot Circumciſion ſeal this to them as well? The end of Seals is to *confirm* Faith: had not they, have not we need to have our Faith ſtrenthned? Is the Anabaptiſts Faith ſo

ſtrong

ſtrong, that they need no Seals?

2ly, I took God's *Signs* to be *Seals*, by the Apoſtle's Authority: I look on the Rain-bow which God calls, *Gen.*9. 12, 13. the *Token*, אות [the ſame word uſed, *Gen.* 17. 11. of Circumciſion] of his Covenant, to be not only a Sign, but a Seal of his Covenant, that he will not drown the World.

3ly. But why do you ſay, it ſealed that Promiſe; What did it ſeal nothing but that? That Promiſe is not mentioned in this Chapter, but in the 12th, and 22th; but in this Chapter, ſo ſoon as the Lord had made the Covenant between himſelf, *Abraham*, and his Seed, immediately the the Lord adds this Circumciſion, and calls it his Covenant. I am ſure it ſeals this, and I doubt not but the *Jews* did ſo look upon it, as a Seal of the Covenant between God and them; that God was their God, and they his people.

Sir, you muſt give me better grounds than theſe, or elſe I muſt ſtill be of the opinion of the great body of the moſt learned and pious Divines; *viz. That all the Sacraments of the Old and New Teſtament, were and are Signs of the Covenant, ſealing up the Grace of God to Believers.* My Author

thor hath more Notions about Circumcision: but of them afterwards.

*In the Child, Circumcision left a signal Impression*, saith he.

*A.* 1. That which you call a signal Impression, God calls his Covenant. But

2ly, Though there were a signal Impression left in the Infant, yet if when it came to years it were not taught the spiritual meaning of it, the Child would get no benefit by it.

3ly, What signal Impression is left upon those whom you baptize by Dipping, when *Adult*, more than upon those who are baptized by pouring of Water upon them when Infants? True, you can remember better you were dipped; but Children, tho' they have but a moral certainty from their Parents and others, and the Testimony of the Book in which they are recorded, yet being taught the meaning of it, and especially if as some Parents who compose short Prayers for their Children, put in that Petition, for the blessing of their Baptism, as some Parents do; Children may keep it in mind, and in time come to make as good use of it, as those who are dipped when *Adult*; and Experience I hope will prove it.

4ly,

4ly, If that be true which Mr. *Tombes* is willing to believe out of Mr. *Selden*, that the *Jews* admitted *Proselites*, by *Baptism* the female kind, the same Author *Mr. Selden*, and so *Baxter* tells us, the Children also of the *Proselites* were admitted by *Baptism*; to what purpose saith the *Anaba tist*, since they understand it not, and there is no Impression left? Let the *Jews* answer that.

5ly, *Abraham*'s Seed being so numerous as the Stars in the Heavens, how could the Infants circumcised, when they came to riper years, and living only in *Canaan*, know that there was any Signal Impression made upon their flesh, unless their Parents or others told them: might not they well think all men were as they, or it might be proper to their Nation? If they then were certain by their Parents and others informing them, cannot we be as certain by our Parents Information, that we were baptized?

6ly, May there not be a Conveyance of a great *Estate* to a *Child* that lies in the Cradle, and understand nothing many years; but when it comes to ripe years, and see its Name in the Conveyance, and the Witnesses, now it can sue for it. Two things are very desirable, if there were nothing to trouble the Conscience [a thing

to be lamented ] and other things concur. First, That *Baptiſm* ſhould ever be adminiſtred in the face of the Church. Secondly, The Names of all baptized Recorded; [ both which I have known the conſtant practice in Independent Churches: ] By both which, and Parents Education, a Child when it comes to years of underſtanding, may be as ſure of its *Baptiſm*, though it makes no Impreſſion as Circumciſion did in the fleſh, and now ſue out the Bleſſings which there the Lord did ſignifie, and conditionally ſeal to be mine.

7ly, Were our Churches in that order they ought to be; and were that laudable Practice [ which certainly is our Duty ] taken up, *viz.* That ſpecial care be taken, that Children baptized be diligently Catechized, and when they come to fit years, be called before the Elderſhip, there to own their Baptiſmal Covenant, and give an account of their Faith; ſolemn Prayer made for them, and the Church now to take care of them, and inſpection over them, as being their Members; there would be no room for this Objection, and leſs ground for *Anabattiſts* to cry down *Infant-battiſm*. If we will keep Churches [ ſo far as our Duty can reach ] for Chriſt, it is not preaching a Sermon

or

or two on the *Lord's-Day*, will do the work, there is more required than so.

Though the *Anabaptists* strength lie in the incapacity of Infants to believe in Christ, yet because this notion hath been a trouble to me heretofore, therefore I speak the more to it.

5ly, *This Covenant never repealed by God.* Now I come to the Pinch: Mr. *Tombes* the greatest Adversary that ever the Seed of Believers had, yields two things.

1. *That the Children of the* Jews *were Members with their Parents in the Jewish Church.* [But then, say I, it must be by vertue of this Parental-Covenant God made with *Abraham*; else how they should be Members with their Parents, I know not.]

2ly, *That if the Children of believing Parents, be Members of the Church with the Parents, then they must be baptized. For I grant,* (saith he) *that Baptism is the way and manner of solemn Admission into the Church, I mean the regular way.*

Then the Question must be thus stated.

Quest. *When the* Jews *believed in Christ, come, crucified, risen, and ascended, as the five thousand in* Acts 4. 4. *Did the Lord now repeal his Covenant which he made with*

Abraham *and his Seed*; *admit only the Parents into the Gospel-Church, but bar the Doors against their Posterity, or Children?*

I think I have stated the Question right, and if this cannot be proved, then I hope believing *Gentiles* shall find a way to bring in their Children too with the *Jews*, and find a Title to Baptism by Mr. *Tombes*'s Concession.

*Affirmanti incumbit probatio*; This lie upon the *Anabaptists* to prove. And here though I am far from that absurd, irrational Principle of *Veronius*, who lays down this for a Rule in our Disputation with the *Papists*; That we must bring expres Scriptures to confute them, yet this casting all the Posterity of the Godly out of the Church, is so *wretched a Doctrine*, [as Mr. *Thomas Hooker* calls it] against the poor Infants, that as yet want a Tongue to plead for themselves, that the *Anabaptists* must bring Scriptures, if not expres, yet as clear and strong as expres Scriptures, else I shall little regard their Writings. And this I require upon these grounds.

First, The *Anabaptists* require of us an expres Command from Christ to the Apostles, to baptize Infants. This was put upon me in the Congregation: Now it is meet the *Anabaptists* should be honest men, buy

buy and sell by the same measure. If they require of us expres Scriptures, we may well require of them the same.

Secondly, All the Arguments which the *Anabaptists* draw from Scripture against Infants Church-membership, and Baptism, do strike at the Grace and Wisdom of God in his Covenant with *Abraham* and his Seed, and his Constitution of the Church of the *Jews*, as if the Lord had not done wisely, but they will teach him how to Constitute Churches better. We shall hear their Arguments anon.

Thirdly, The holy Page tells us, how much weight the *Jews* and false Teachers put upon Circumcision, what a stir it made in the Churches, while the Apostles laboured to remove it, though it was a painfull bloody Ordinance. We read *Acts* 21. 21. This was the great Objection against *Paul*, and this was 21 years after *Paul*'s Conversion: I am apt to think till the *Temple* [the head of all the Ceremonies] was utterly demolished; the believing *Jews* did Circumcise their Children: But had *Paul* told them, the Reason was, that Christ is come, and now the Covenant with *Abraham* as to his Seed, is repealed, and their Seed are all *cast out* of the *Church*, and therefore they must not Circumcise

their Children: Should we not have read the *Jews* Clamours and Out-cries againſt the Apoſtles, in the *Acts*, and in every Epiſtle, and what a bar had this been againſt the reception of the Goſpel; I appeal to the Conſciences of the *Anabaptiſts*. But though we read of *Circumciſion* in ſeveral places, both in the *Acts* and the *Epiſtles*, there is not one word of this.

Fourthly, God did expreſly repeal his Covenant with *Iſrael* made at Mount *Sinai*, Heb. 8. 13. *That which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vaniſh away.* This Covenant of God with *Abraham* and his Seed, is a Covenant much noted in the Scripture, and long before *Sinai-Covenant:* Now if the Lord doth indeed repeal this Covenant with *Abraham*, why ſhould we not expect clear Scripture-ground. The *Jews* quarrelled with the *Apoſtles*, becauſe they changed the Cuſtoms of *Moſes*, *Acts* 6. 14. & chap. 21. v. 21. but if they had taught the nulling of the Covenant of God with *Abraham* their Father too, the Apoſtles ſhould have heard of it with both ears, and we ſhould have read it. God tells them when he repealed that Covenant, He would make a new Covenant with the *Houſe of Iſrael*, and the *Houſe of Judah*: are not Children a part of the *Houſe?* They were ſo when God made

that

that Covenant with the *Houſe of Iſrael*, *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12. then they are in the *Houſe* ſtill, then they are capable of the Grace of the new Covenant with their Parents; then the want of actual Faith doth not exclude them from *Baptiſm*.

Fifthly, God tells *Abraham*, he will *eſtabliſh his Covenant*, ——— *and it ſhall be an everlaſting Covenant*, Gen. 17. 7. If God *eſtabliſh*, it muſt ſtand: If he ſaith, it is *everlaſting*, the Entail is not cut off: Nor do I doubt in the leaſt, but as when they rejected Chriſt, and ſaid, *Let his blood be upon us and our children*, Mat. 27. 25. God did caſt away Parents and Children: ſo when God receives them again, *Rom.* 11. 15. 26. the Parents ſhall not be received, and Children remain caſt out, but they ſhall come in with their Parents.

If they ſay, the word *Everlaſting*, is ſpoken of their poſſeſſion of *Canaan*, verſe 8. and *Circumciſion*, v. 13.

*Anſ.* I know well how the word לעולם *for ever*, or *everlaſting* is taken in Scripture, but it doth not at all hinder the Argument.

1. For in this Covenant is nothing *Typical*, it is pure Grace; and we have other Scriptures in the Goſpel will confirm it.

2. As to Circumciſion, it was a *bloody Ordinance*, as was the *Paſſeover*, all *Ordi-*

*nances* ſo, till Chriſt came with his *Blood* fulfilling all, removed them: No more *blood* in any *Ordinance* after Chriſt. *Zipporah* calls *Moſes* a *bloody Husband*, at the Circumciſing of her Son, *Exod.* 4. 25, 26. At this time when the *Jews* circumciſe their Children; they ſay they may do it from Sun-riſing to Sun-ſetting, any hour on the Eighth day: but they chooſe the Morning, becauſe the Child then being empty, it will not bleed ſo much: The *Mohet*, or he that circumciſeth, ſucks the Wound three times, and uſe other means to ſtop the *blood*, but no *bloody Ordinance* now. [*Buxt. Synor. Iſid.* p. 81.86.]

3. For the Land of *Canaan*, that was conditional, their abiding in it; but however, though they are now caſt out of poſſeſſion, yet they have *jus ad rem*, a juſt Title to it at this day. Hence *Ezek.* 37. 14. 21. & *Ezek.* 36. 24. Three times the Lord promiſed to *bring them into their own Land*, ver. 28. the Promiſe runs for them. It is *their own*; *then now to depart from the literal ſenſe, without ſome eminent abſurdity that will follow upon the literal ſenſe, we ought not.*

6ly, If God will not bring an *unclean Creature* forbidden, into a *believing Jew's Houſe*, without an *expreſs word* to *warrant it*, will God caſt a *holy Seed* out of *his Houſe*, and

and not give as *clear a ground* to the *believing Parent* to know his *mind?* The *unclean Creatures* ſignifying the *Heathen* of ſeveral ſorts, [the *Hebrews* ſay, *Babylonians, Medes, Perſians, Greeks, Romans*] *not eat*; that is, not to have *communion*, Acts 10.28. Compare *Levit.* 11. 5, 6, 7. with *Acts* 10. 11, 12, 13, 15. and muſt now the *holy Seed* be caſt out of the Church, and looked upon as the *Swine* were then? We muſt have *clearer grounds* and *Texts*, than ever yet the *Anabaptiſts* have brought, I ſay as ſtrong as *expreſs Scriptures.*

7ly, The *New Teſtament* doth give us *clear Texts* to prove the *Church-memberſhip* of *believing Parents*; you cannot give us *clearer Texts* for their *unchurching*, unleſs you give us *expreſs Scriptures.*

8ly, Let me take up one of Mr. *Baxter's Arguments*, and improve it my way.

*If God hath repeled his Covenant, and caſt the Seed of the believing Jews out of the Church, then it was either in juſtice or in mercy.*

*But neither this nor that; therefore not caſt out, &c. thus Mr.* Baxter.

For the firſt, not in *juſtice*, I prove thus. Let *Parents* be never ſuch *ſound Believers*, walk in *the ſteps of their Father Abraham*, keep cloſe in the *Covenant*, yet the *Anabaptiſts* caſt out all their *Seed*; but this can-

cannot be in *justice*: for the *Text* saith, *Psal.* 25. 10. *All the paths of the Lord are mercy and truth unto such as keep his Covenant.* But these *Jews*, *believing Parents* do so; yet God repeals his *Covenant* with their *Seed*, and cast them out of the Church.

2. *In mercy* the Lord *doth it not; For then God gives a greater mercy in the room of that which in mercy he takes away*, saith Mr. *Baxter*.

This is true what Mr. *Baxter* saith, I prove what he saith, the *believing Jew* shall say, though God hath repealed his *Covenant* with my *Seed*, and cast them out of the Church, yet he hath given my *Seed* a *better mercy*, both my self and my children, if they could speak, would say, *We would not be under* Abraham's *Covenant with our Parents, nor* Church-Members *with our Parents, as we were before Christ came, for Christ hath left us Infants a better Blessing in the room.* As it was a *great favour* to the *Israelites*, that *God gave his Oracles to them*, Psalm 147. 19, 28. That *God was in Covenant with them*, *Ephes.* 2. 12. But God will *null that Covenant*, Heb. 8. 13. It shall *vanish away*: But God will make *another Covenant, new*, a *better Covenant*, having *better Promises* in the room of *that old vanishing Covenant*: So that if *Israels eyes be opened*, they would say, *they would by no means*

means *be under the old Covenant, this new is so much better.* Thus let the *Anabaptists* tell us what God hath left *better* for the *Infant-Seed* of a *Jew* now *believing in Christ*, that now it would not be *Church-member* with the *Parents*, nor under *Abraham's Covenant*, nor would now be *baptized*, as before Christ they were *circumcised:* For my part I can conceive nothing; keep to the state of the Question.

9. There is *so much evil* in this *Doctrine* and *Practice* of the *Anabaptists*, that we must have *clearer Scriptures* than ever were produced as yet to prove it, and clear it from *that evil.*

As 1. For the blessed God; How doth it *dishonour him in straitning his Love and Grace now under the Gospel*, over it was *under the Law. Moses* tells the *Jews*, Deut. 4. 37. *The Lord loved thy Fathers*, Chap. 7. 8. & Chap. 33. 3. So it appears, *that he would not only take the Fathers, but their Children also into Covenant, and constitute his Church of them also.* But now whatever the Gospel saith of the *Philanthropie of God*, *Tit.* 3. 4. and *God so loving the world*, Joh. 16. 3. when that *Seed* promised to *Abraham* is come, *in whom all Nations shall be blessed*, he *nulls* the *Covenant* with his *Seed*, cast them out of the Church, and leaves no *blessing for their*

*Infants,*

*Infants*, when their *Parents believe in the promiſed Seed* come.

Before the Lord calls the little *children under the Covenant*, and *in the Church*, (*Mine*) Ezek. 16. 20, 21. But now the *Jews believe in Chriſt*, God calls *none* of their Children *Mine*, though now they do more gladly *bear them unto him* than they did before.

2ly, It *diſhonours Chriſt*; He *took upon him indeed the Seed of* Abraham, *Heb.* 2. 16. and turned the *Seed* of *Abraham* out of the *Covenant*, and out of the *Church*, if the *Anabaptiſts Doctrine be true.*

Though he ſeemed to have an *affection* to *Children*, and was much *diſpleaſed* with his *Diſciples*, when they rebuked the *Parents* when they came to ſeek his *bleſſing for their Babes*, Mark 10. 13, 14. and bad them bring their *children to him*, and told them, of *ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven.* If our ſweet Lord *meant* as he *ſpake*, and we *believe he did*, then they are ſtill *Members of the Church*, he doth not ſhut the *Door againſt them, now he is come.* But the *Anabaptiſts* tell us a *contrary Tale* to the *diſhonour* of our *bleſſed Saviour.* When the *believing Jews* now carry their *children* to Chriſt, Dedicate them to him with earneſt Prayer *in Baptiſm*, and ingage to bring them up

for

for him, the *Anabaptiſts forbid them*, and tell them, *the Kingdom of Heaven doth not conſiſt of ſuch little Ones.*

*Per abſurdum vero eſt, ut per Meſſiæ adventum imminutum ſit fœdus ſanctu*, Voſſius. *Gen.* 17.7. That the *bleſſed*, and *bleſſing*, *Meſſia*, by his *coming*, ſhould *null the Covenant* with *Abraham*, it is *not only abſurd*, but *very abſurd*, a great *reproach* is caſt upon Chriſt.

Doctor *Thomas Goodwin* pleading the *Infant's caſe* againſt the *Anabaptiſts*, ſaith, 'In 'a manner half the Church of God, the pureſt 'part of it; Elect Infants die in their bud and 'infancy, and grow not up to partake of the 'dews and influence of any other outward Or'dinance; and were they deprived of this, [i.e. 'Baptiſm] ſhould go out of this world [into 'which God only ſent them to receive that 'which ſhould make them meet for the common 'Inheritance of the Saints] without any out'ward owning them, or viſible way of bleſſing 'from him, &c.—yea and the other half that 'grow up to glorifie God in their riper years, 'whereof many alſo are holy from the Womb; 'theſe alſo ſhould, during their years of nonage, 'want an outward badg, and any outward ac'knowledgment of what they are, even Fellow'heirs of the Kingdom with their Brethren, 'which even in the Infancy of the World, 'whilſt all were under Tutors and Govern-

'ours

*ours was their priviledge.* Thus this *Gospel-Divine* speaks, and that to the purpose.

3ly, As to *Parents*, be they never so *godly*, what *grief* must it needs be to them, if their *children* die out of the *Covenant* and *visible Church*; what *hopes* can they have of their *Salvation*, more than an *Indian* hath of his being both in the same state? An *Indian-child* may be *Elected* as well as a sound *Believer*. 2ly, nor can a *believing Parent* pray for his *children* upon any *grounds* more than an *Indian*: the *Covenant and Promises* scattered in the World to the *Godly* and their *Seed*, they *cannot* plead upon them. 3ly, Whereas the *Covenant* and the *Engagement* of the *children* to God in *Baptism*, is the *Infant's Circumcision*, might be *Arguments* to *whet* upon their *children*, and encourage them: now no such *Arguments* are in *date*. 4ly, The *Jews* before Christ came, in the day of their *circumcising their Infants*, did use to give *thanks to God*, and *bless him* for *Abraham's Covenant*, and his *Ordinance* of *Circumcision*, the *Seal* of his *Covenant*: but when the *Jews* believe Christ's *come*, now *Thanksgiving and blessing of God* cease; for the *Covenant* is *nulled*, *children* cast out of the *Church*.

4ly, As for the *Children of believing Parents*, if they come *to years of discretion*, and

God

God bleſs *Parents inſtructions* ſo as to keep *Conſcience awake*, though they play the *wretches*, and have cauſe to be humbled all their days; yet I ſay, if *Conſcience* be kept *awake*, and God begin to open their Eyes more, and make them in *earneſt* to mind the *Salvation* of their *Souls*, then they will underſtand what a *wretched Doctrine*, this *Doctrine* of the *Anabaptiſts* is, by *denying that to them* by which they may take hold of God in the time of their fears. *Quare patet non prorſus vanum eſſe atque inane ex pio genere naſci*, ſaith *Peter Martyn*, [Hoc Com. p. 8.] It is not a vain empty thing to be *born of godly Parents*: this is true which he ſaith.

Here, tho' it was far from my thoughts to ſpeak, much leſs to write what *benefit* I have *experimentally found* from a *Parental-Covenant*, and *Infant-Baptiſm*; yet becauſe the *Lord's Providence* hath engaged me in this *Controverſie*, which I never intended, and becauſe it may be a help to others, *Children of good Parents*, I ſhall declare.

God bleſſed my *godly Parents Education* of me, to keep my *Conſcience awake*, as I ſaid; though I have cauſe to *abhor my ſelf* all my days; but above fifty years paſt, I began to have more *ſerious thoughts* about

about an *eternal ſtate*, and how to get an *Intereſt in Chriſt* and the *Promiſes*. I found *ſeveral qualifications* that did prepare hearts for *Promiſes*, Iſa. 61. 1. *Iſa.* 55. 1, 2. *Mat.* 11. 28. *Luke* 19. 10. My trouble for ſome years, now how to make out theſe *qualifications:* I would have them, prayed for them, but could not ſatisfie my ſelf that I had them as I ought to have them. While I was writing my Copy, theſe very words, there comes to me a good *chriſtian woman*, who I know for many years had walked with God, and ſhe puts this *Queſtion* to me, *How ſhe might know whether ſhe ever had theſe qualifications*, in Mat. 11. 28. and engaged me to ſend *one Exerciſe* upon it, as I did: I could not but take notice of this *Providence*.

While I was thus troubled about making out theſe *qualifications*, there comes a *motion* into my *mind*; *What ſay you to your Father's Covenant?* You know your *Parents* were *godly*, and God promiſed *to be the God of* Abraham *and his ſeed*; will you ſtand to your *Father's Covenant*, and chooſe your *Father's God* for your God? I began to think of it, my heart anſwered, *Yes, I will ſtand to my Father's Covenant:* But how do you take your *Father's God to be your God?* I anſwered, *As he was my Father's God.* My teaching *God*, my heart-humbling

bling *God*, my reconciled *God*, my juſtifying *God*, my ſanctifying *God*, my *God* to lead me all my days; for thus he was my *Father's God*. Here my *qualification* was the *choice* of my *Father's God*, who was mine before by an *external Covenant-adminiſtration*; but now to have him *my God, my portion*, by an *internal Covenant* and *efficacy?* Here now I was pent up; *Will you chooſe him, or refuſe him?* Bleſſed be God who gave me this *advantage* to lay hold upon him, by virtue of this *Parental-Covenant*.

Further, to clear my *meaning*, Ido not by this *Diſcourſe* about *Qualifications of Promiſes*, intend that Chriſtians ſhould not regard them. I am far from that: if they be *ſound Chriſtians*, I'le warrant them they ſhall regard them. Nor do I think but Chriſtians reflecting upon themſelves, the *good Spirit aſſiſting*, may find them *certainly wrought*.

But this I mean, *Young perſons* brought up under the *droppings* of *good Education*, upon whom God works more *gradually*; that cannot tell the *time when*, nor the *manner how God works*; as ſome Adult perſons upon whom God many times breaks in with his *Terrours*; theſe uſe to be much troubled about the making out the *qualifi-*

vations *of Inviting Promises*, because they cannot find them so sensibly as they would, though they have them *in truth*, but cannot *discern it*: the question is, *Whether now* Abraham's *Covenant may not do such a Soul a pleasure?*

Quest. *When God made this Covenant with* Abraham *and his Seed, did not God intend good to* Abraham's *Seed? If not, it was a vain Covenant? God forbid.*

To say, it signifies no more than that, when he gave *them his Oracles*, Rom. 3. 2. Was not that a Priviledge, if his *Seed would improve them?*

But this *Covenant* was *distinct* from the *Oracles*, made before the *Oracles were given*: and may not *Abraham*'s *Seed*? *ought* they not to *improve it* to their *spiritual good and advantage*: who will deny it?

God in *Isa.* 56. 4. speaks of *taking hold of his Covenant*. I say, by this *Covenant* God puts forth his hand to *Abraham's Seed* to take hold upon him, so as to become their *God for ever*.

1. Suppose we two sorts of persons under the *Conviction of a miserable state*: One sort is under *Abraham's Covenant*, the other not; There are *Inviting Promises* to all sorts, whether without, or within the *Covenant*. They who are within the *Covenant*, can

can make use of all the *Inviting Promises* offered to others, and *Abraham's Covenant* too: But they who are out of the *Covenant*, cannot make use of, or lay hold upon God by *Abraham's Covenant*.

2ly, God is *nearer to his Covenanted-seed* than to *others*, Psalm 148. 14. *Israel a people near unto the Lord: Israel* is in *Covenant* with him: *God loved their Fathers*, Deut. 4. 37. By this he puts forth his hand to them to lay hold upon him more immediately, than to others out of Covenant. The choosing of their *Father's God* for their *God* in *sincerity*, is the Condition, and he becomes *their God*, and his Covenant gives them a ground for the *assurance of it*.

3ly, This *Covenanted-Seed* may plead with God in *Prayer* for many Promises made to the *Upright* and their *Seed*, Psal. 112. 2. Prov. 20. 7. with divers other Promises, fetching the *strength* of their pleading from the Covenant and Promises, which others out of the Covenant cannot do. And since God hath promised *blessing* to this *Seed*; the *Seed* may choose their *blessing*, any *spiritual blessing* in Christ, and have his Promise to warrant it.

4ly, When their hearts are in *fears*, *troubles*, *doubts*, and cannot make out the *qualifications* of other Promises, as they

would, they may come hither: here is no winding out, but answer *Catagorice*, *will you have your Father's God, or refuse him?* You see he offers himself, and is in Covenant with you one way already, by an external Covenant-administration; and if you will stand to that Covenant, and take him for your God indeed, and yield up your self to him, he will be your God in a saving manner, and portion for ever.

5ly, Since all the Word and Promises are then efficacious when the Spirit will please to work with them; and it is free for him to make this or that Word efficacious to us: I doubt not to say, *Abraham*'s Covenant, is as fit as any inviting Promise, and it is as rational for the *Seed* of godly Parents to lay hold upon God by it, as by any other Word.

My Parents then looking upon me as being in Covenant, and a Church-member with them, they did Dedicate me to God, and brought me under the Seal of his gracious Covenant in Baptism. And what our Lord said to *Peter* when he washed his Feet, *John* 13. 6, 7. *What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter:* Was truly verified of me. What the Lord did then, when he poured *clean water* upon me in my *Baptism*, I know not, but

but now I do know, and did many years since. What was the opinion of the ancient Fathers, and many Divines now, about the *Efficacy* of *Baptism*, I did not then know, nor do I now concern my self about it, to discourse it. But this I took for a Truth, It doth not consist with the *Infinite wisdom* and *holiness of God*, to Institute any *Ordinance* in his *House* that is of *trivial concernment*, whatever they seem to be to a *carnal heart*: they are things of *great weight*; Where the great God engages himself to a Creature, and therefore to be attended with great *reverence*, and as diligently *improved*. Now when I came to reflect upon my *Baptism*, how God was *first* with me, before I understood him, he was *afore-hand* with me, took hold of me, brought me under the Seal of his blessed Covenant; and when I read over the several *Texts*, which tells us what *blessings* are there *signified* and *sealed*, God was engaged for his part; if I will look to my part, to answer the Condition, then these should be mine; this gave me encouragement. As for my Dedication to him, I was willing to stand to it, I did like it very well: but both for the Condition, and to answer my Dedication, I went to him, whose Covenant it is, and who was *first* with me, that

he would pleaſe to perform his part, and in the ſtrength of his performance, I would perform my part. Why would that *bleſſed One* be *firſt* ? Why did he begin with me, when I did not know him? But ſince he will be a God, and Triumph in his Grace, ſince I came to underſtand it, by his Grace I have held him, and will hold him. And though as I ſaid, I have not *attained* what I ſeek after, yet I have found in my diſmal Temptations, wherein I have had as deep a ſhare as moſt *Chriſtians* ever had, when I could not tell where to lay hold, my *Parental-covenant* and *Infant-baptiſm*, which I am ſtill *improving* now my Head is *gray*, have been a ſupport unto me. So that I bleſs God, 1. for *Abraham's Covenant*, 2ly, I bleſs God that I had *godly Parents*: 3ly, I bleſs God my Parents were no *Anabaptiſts*, but that while I was an *Infant* they brought me under the Seal of the *bleſſed Covenant*, a ſtay and comfort to me in my old age, and I hope *improved*, as well as they who were Dipped yeſterday.

When people do either not underſtand things, or if they do, yet they do not mind and improve them, ſo get no good by them; no wonder though they talk againſt them, when others bleſs God for them, and daore his grace in them. Let.

Let the Children of Godly Parents look to themselves, they have a price in their hands, if they have wisdom and hearts to improve it; it is a fearful thing to hear of the Child of a Godly, Praying, Parent to dye in an unconverted State.

Only a word, some may think you had Godly Parents, mine were not so; it may be I had a Godly Grandfather, or a Mother: had you so? no doubt but you may improve the *Covenant* from him. The second *Commandement* will help you.

*David* pleaded 86 *Psal.* 16. *Save the Son of thy Hand-maid:* he pleads the Parental-*Covenant* (saith Mr. *Hooker.*) Born thy Servant of Godly Parents, who were thy Servitors (saith *Ainsworth?*) *Insignis est priorum prærogativa, qua etiam* David, *hic animum suum in precibus fulcit, quod sciunt se in Ecclesiâ a fidelibus Parentibus, qui fuerunt servi, & ancillæ Domini, natos esse.* Saith *Gesner* on the Text, and stirs up Parents to learn this *Treasure* to their Children; and Children of such Parents to make use of it. *Junius* also speaks well to this Head.

Others it may be will say, *Baptised I am, but my Parents bad enough.* Well, art awake, and art in earnest for Christ, and the saving Blessings come by him? you may improve your *Baptism.* When the *Gibeonites*

*nites* by Craft got *Israel* into a *Covenant* with them, and confirmed it by an Oath. 9 *Josh.* 15. the God of *Israel* would not suffer them to destroy them; They were made Servants indeed; the breach of this cost *Israel* dear. 2 *Sam.* 21. 1, 2, 3. If you be got under the Seal of the *Covenant*, it was not by Craft, but God's Providence ordered it; and now you are under it, prize it, and improve it; do not you fear, the God of *Israel* will hold to his part.

These being the Evils that arise from the *Anabaptists Doctrine*, we must have very clear *Texts*, for the nulling of *Abraham's Covenant*, and casting Children out of the *Church*.

10ly, If *Blessed Jesus* upon his coming doth repeat *Abraham's Covenant*, and so the Children of the *Believing Jews* be no *Church-Members*, then *Jesus Christ* by his coming doth null the *Promises* made to the *Fathers*. But the *Text* saith, *Rom.* 15. 8. *He confirms the Promises made to the Fathers*. I am sure this was one made to the *Fathers*, *I will be a God to thee and thy Seed*, then it is not nulled, but confirmed: Christ confirms *Abraham's Charter*, *Act.* 3. 26. God sent his Son *Jesus* to the *Jews* first, to Bless them: one great Blessing he mentions, but it seems by the *Anabaptists*, *Christ* takes away a Blessing;

tell

tell us I pray what Bleſſing doth *Chriſt* leave the Seed of the *Believing Jews*, while *Infants* in the Room of it.

11ly, We read *Gal.* 3. 16. of *Promiſes* made to *Abraham* and his *Seed*; *Promiſes* in the Plural Number, *Seed* in the Singular, not *Seeds*; the *Jews* a part, and the *Gentiles* a part, not ſo, but *Seed*; that is, *Chriſt* Myſtical, not Perſonal: the *Promiſes* were not made to *Chriſt*, but *Chriſt* was *Promiſed* to *Abraham*; So that it is *Chriſt* in *Aggregato*, the *Jews* and *Gentiles* make up one *Body*, and one *Seed*.

There were ſeveral *Promiſes* made to *Abraham*, ſome concerned him alone, ſome concerned himſelf and his *Seed*, according to the *Fleſh* alone; The *Gentiles* had nothing to do with them: *That all Nations ſhould be Bleſs'd in Abraham's Seed*; This belongs to the *Gentiles*, as well as the *Jews*, This is one *Promiſe*. But we muſt have *Promiſes* in the Plural Number made to *Abraham*, that belong to the *Gentiles*, if you take away this, *I will be the God of thee and thy Seed*, I know not how to make the *Text* true.

But if this be granted, then this *Verſe* and the fourteenth *Verſe* are both true; *now the Bleſſing of Abraham is come upon the Gentiles through Jeſus Chriſt.*

I have inſiſted long upon this Branch, becauſe

becauſe the pinch of the Controverſie lies here, and theſe Grounds are to me ſo ſtrong, that unleſs the *Anabaptiſts* bring *Texts* as ſtrong as an expreſs *Scripture* for the Repeal, I ſhall not regard them: nor am I come yet to the *Texts* in the *New Teſtament*, to prove the *Church-Membership* of *Infants*, though it may be inferred from ſome I have named already.

The laſt Branch in the *Silloglſm* is, That if this Gracious *Covenant* be not Repealed but ſtand firm, *then it muſt be Signed, and Sealed to them who are under it*; this I ſuppoſe will not be denyed. The Bleſſed God makes no *Covenants*, but he Seals them.

That the Tree of Life, and the Tree of the knowledge of Good and Evil, were *Sacraments* and *Seals*, belonging to the firſt *Covenant*, I ſee is the Opinion of very Learned and Godly Divines. When God makes a *Covenant* with *Noah*, and all the *Creatures*, God Seals it; when with *Abraham*, God Seals it; and though the Seal be changed, yet it hath another Seal added in the Room of it. Our weak *Faith* hath need of ſtrengthening, and all too little, if God's Spirit doth not ſtep in.

SECT.

## SECT. IV.

NOw let us come to the *Anabaptists*, and hear how they prove the Repealing of the *Covenant*, and the un-Churching of the Children of *Believing Jews*.

About a quarter of a year after I had finished my *Discourse*, a *Neighbour* brought me Mr. *Edward Hutchinson* against *Pædobabtism*, to read it, but it was sent for again, so that I did but read his *Epistle* to the *Baptized Congregations*; and a Letter, which I think concerned Mr. *Wills*, and the beginning of his Book, *p.* 3. he states the *Question*, and proves, *That the Infants of Believing Gentiles are not the Seed of Abraham; so that Infant Church-Membership and Baptism falls to the Ground.*

*Anſ.* But he must prove that the *Infants* of the *Believing Jews*, are not the *Seed of Abraham*, or else *Infants Church-Membership* does not fall. I had reason to state the *Question* so, as to the *Believing Jews*; but if he will yield the *Infants* of *Believing Jews* to be *Members*, and have a Right to *Baptism*, I will prove the *Infants* of *Believing Gentiles* are *Church-Members*, and have a Right to *Baptism*. *There is neither Jew nor Greek*, &c. *Gal.* 3. 28. no difference

rence now but of this more hereafter.

Again, we ſhall ſee whether his Arguments do not cut off the *Infants* of *Believing Jews*, as well as *Gentiles*.

1. *Argu.* His firſt *Sillogiſm*, *If none be the Children of Abraham, but thoſe that do the works of Abraham, then Infants are not the Seed of Abraham, but the Antecedent is true.* Joh. 8. 39. Therefore,

*Anſ.* If none be rational Creatures, but thoſe that can *Sillogize*, as Mr. *Hutchiſon* doth, then *Infants* are not rational Creatures. But, *&c.*

If you ſay my Antecedent is falſe, ſo is yours; but it ſhews how ſtrong your Argument is.

2. If *Iſaac* at eight Days old, when *Circumciſed*, do not the works of his *Father Abraham*, then he is not *Abraham's Seed*; you argue from no *Doing*, to no *Seed*. A ſtrange Argument Sir!

3. If any of thoſe *Jews*, to whom our Lord ſpake theſe words, had any Male-Children born that day, they had been reputed *Abraham's Seed*, *Members* of the *Church*, and muſt be *Circumciſed* the eigth day, or Sin.

2. *Argu.* His ſecond *Sillogiſm*, *If thoſe who are Chriſt's are only Abraham's Seed, then Infants are not Abraham's Seed, but the Antecedent*

*tecedent is true.* Gal. 3. 3. 19. *they are not Christs by Calling.*

*Anſ.* Is there no way to be made Chriſt's, but by *Calling?* can he that made the Ear and the Heart, come no way to the Heart, but by the Ear? what Divinity is this? cannot he that infuſes the Soul into the Body, infuſe Grace into the Soul, but by the Ear? E

2. Chriſt commands little Children to be brought to him, and none to forbid them. *Mark* 10. 13, 14. &c. *Of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven,* then they muſt be Chriſt's; we believe Chriſt, Sir, before you.

3. Becauſe *Iſaac* at eight days old, cannot anſwer a Call of Chriſt's, therefore he is none of Chriſt's, a good Argument. Was *John* none of Chriſt's, when he leaped in his Mothers Womb, when *Mary* came to *Elizabeth?* Luk. 1. 44.

*Argu.* 3. His third *Sillogiſm, If none be Bleſſed with Abraham, but thoſe that are of Faith, than Infants are not the Seed of Abraham, but the Antecedent is true.* Gal. 3. 9. Therefore,

*Anſ.* Does the *Text* ſay *Actual Faith?*

2. Alas, poor *Infants!* by this *Author* ye are Curſed, no poor *Infant* dying an *Infant,* can be Bleſſed. Yea, thoſe *Infants* whom Chriſt Bleſſed, *Mark* 10. 16. were Curſed though he Bleſſed them, for they could not

Act *Faith* upon Christ. Did *Isaac* when *Circumcised* the eighth Day, put forth an Act of *Faith* upon Christ to come?

3. Believers in Christ are so, either { *Actually* or *Siminally*.

4. *Actual* Believers in Christ are so, either { *Visibly and Really*, or *Visibly only*.

*Visibly only*, such were those, to whom in your *Preface to your Baptised Congregations*, you thus speak, *they are not all Israel, that are of Israel. I know there is dross mingled with your Silver, Chaff among your Wheat, and the* Canaanite *is still in the Land.* It seems then you find *Dross*, *Chaff*, *Canaanites*, and not true *Israelites* in your *Baptised Congregations*; but you did look on them as *visible Believers*, when you Dipped them.

2. *Seminally* so, and they first; such as are Reputed so by God's *Covenant*, with *Believing Parents* and their *Seed*. 2ly, Such, who besides this Reputation, are regenerated by the Spirit, which is not without *Faith Seminally*.

*Argu.* 4. His fourth *Sillogism*, *If the Children of the Flesh are not the Children of God*,

*God, then Infants now are not the Seed of Abraham, but the Antecedent is true.* Rom. 9. 8. Therefore, *&c.*

*Anſ.* I deny the Conſequence.

2ly, It ſeems then, no *Infants* are the Children of God, by this Argument; a very bold and wretched Aſſertion.

2. There is a double *Adoption*, External, Eccleſiaſtical, and Internal, Heavenly Saving, that hath a Heavenly, Eternal Inheritance belonging to it; they who had only the firſt, theſe were called the Children of God. *Deut.* 14. 1. and 16. *Ezek.* 21. to theſe pertain the *Adoption.* Rom. 9. 4.

Our *Queſtion* is not who are the true Children of God, that have that Inheritance prepared for them, but who are to be Reputed the Children of God, *in foro Eccleſiaſtico*, Viſibly; ſo that they are Members of a Viſible Church, and have Right to a Viſible Ordinance, in the Viſible Church. The *Droſs*, the *Chaff*, the *Canaanites*, the *falſe Iſraelites*, which you tell us, are in your *Baptized Congregations*, are none of the Children of God, in a ſaving Senſe; but your *Baptiſts* did judge them to be Believers Actually in Chriſt, if ſo, then Children of God, then you admited them Members of your Churches, and ſo Baptized them by Dipping. They

were

were looked upon as *Abraham's Seed*, when you admitted them.

The next thing he falls upon is, *Act.* 2. 39. of which after.

I could go no further, the Book was sent for, nor did I intend to make any large Discourse, though it had continued with me: by these four Arguments we have a taste of the Man's strength.

By these Arguments, [and the next which follows, which is in all their mouths] let the *Reader* judge, whither they do not all strike as much at the Grace and Wisdom of God, in his *Covenanting* with *Abraham*, and his *Seed*; Constituting the Church of the *Jewish* Parents, and their *Seed*, and Circumcising of the *Infants*, as they do prove, that now the *Infants* should not be admitted into the Gospel-Church, nor Baptised. So that the *Anabaptists* tells God, that if he will Constitute the Church of the *Jews* right, he must let their Children be grown up. First, Learn to know the God of *Abraham*. Second, Put forth an Actual Faith in Christ, the Promised *Seed* to come, as *Abraham* saw his Day and rejoyced. *Joh.* 8. 56. Thirdly, Let them do the works of their *Father Abraham*. *Joh.* 8. 39. Fourthly, Let them manifest that they are really the Children of God, then admit

them

them Members, and Circumciſe them. Does not all their Arguments tend to this? they will teach the Holy, Wiſe God, how to Conſtitute Churches better. I will not be afraid to ſay, That all the *Anabaptiſts* that ever were, or ſhall be, ſhall never be able to caſt the *Seed* of Believing Parents out of the Church, by any Conſequence drawn from any *Text* in the *Bible*, therefore they muſt give us clearer *Texts*, before we ſhall believe them.

## SECT. V.

BUt come we to the great Argument, which all uſe, and that wherewith I was aſſaulted. *Matth.* 28. 19. and *Mark* 16. 16. *Only Believers are to be Baptiſed.* To which I Anſwer,

This took with me in my Meditations, I thought there was ſtrength in it.

Had the *Goſpel-Church* been firſt erected amongſt the *Gentiles*, and had *Baptiſm* been firſt Inſtituted in the *Gentile-Churches*, then the *Anabaptiſts* Argument from hence, would have carryed me. But the firſt *Goſpel-Church* was erected among the *Jews*, in *Jeruſalem*, and *Baptiſm* was Inſtituted in the *Jewiſh-Church* firſt, where the *Anabaptiſts* cannot deny but the *Infants* were Mem-

bers with their *Parents*, and under the Seal of the *Covenant*. So that they must first prove that by this *Text*, the Children of the *Believing Jews* in the *Gospel-Church*, were not Members with their *Parents*, which I am sure cannot be forced from this *Text*, nor doth it in the least prove the Repealing of *Abraham's Covenant* with his *Seed*.

*Circumcision* did Seal up the *Promised Seed*, in whom all Nations should be Blessed, or *Christ* to come; and surely required, therefore their *Faith* in the *Messiah* to come. After Christ's Ascension, in the *Gospel-Church Baptism* seals up this *Promised Seed*, or *Christ* now come, with a full and clear Revelation of him; the difference of the *Faith* as to the Object of it, is only *Christ* to come, and come. If then the Children of the *Jews*, while the Parents did believe in the *Messiah* to come, were under a *Covenant*, Reputed Members of the Church, and *Circumcised*; should, when thir Parents believe in *Christ* come, be cast out of *Covenant*, out of the Church, and not *Baptised*, I know no Reason, nor Warrant from God's Word; this would have made strange work.

If the *Anabaptists* say the *Jews did not believe in the Messiah to come*, they must prove it; the *Messiah* ran much in their minds,

we

we may see by the Woman of *Samaria*. *Joh.* 4. 25. Read *Acts* 26. 7. and by the *Jews*. *Joh.* 1. 19, 20, 21. If Christ were then clearly revealed, why should this cast the *Infant* out? the *Infant* is not therefore guilty of the more Sin, when Christ was clearly revealed, and so deserve to be cast out.

We are to consider Ordinances in their Institution, wherefore God appointed them, what they carry in them, in their own Nature, and what Men ought to do who partake of them, not what Men do; we know what *Baptism* signifies, what it implies, and what they ought to do who partake of it, though Men abuse it. The Case was the same as to *Circumcision*.

That this was one thing it Sealed up, as I said, the *Promise* of Christ to come, the *Anabaptists* cannot deny, and it is the true Answer which *Pererius* gives, from *Aquinus*, to that *Question*, what was the difference between the *Circumcision* of the *Jews*, and of other *Nations*? for that other *Nations* did *Circumcise* besides the *Jews*, not only *Cyprian*, *de ratione Circumvis*, & *Hierom.* on *Jer.* 9. *ult.* [who upon that *Text* I think well;] but also *Herodotus*, who lived some hundreds of *years before Christ* in *Xerxes*'s Time, tells us, insomuch, that *Herodotus* saith the *Jews* took it up from the *Egyptians*; among

whom it was in so much esteem, that there was no entrance into the most Honourable Offices amongst them, unless they were *Circumcised*. Now *Pererius* makes this difference: *Other Nations used it, taking it up as a custom and right, transmitted to them from their fore-Fathers, whom they had in Honour. But the* Jews *used it, as it was a Sacrament containing in it, the Profession of their Faith and Obedience towards God, and the Divine Promise of the* Messiah *to come*; he adds, *And Extiation of Original Sin*, as the Ancients speak of *Baptism*, and so many do now.

That other *Nations* do not use it as a Seal of God's *Covenant*, it appears by the time of *Circumcising*; the day God appointed, was the eigth day, but *Ishmael's* Posterity, *Circumcise* in the thirteenth year of their Age, then *Ishmael* was *Circumcised*; so that it is meerly in Honour of him, so *Josephus* tells us. *l.* 1. *c.* 12.

To go on, If then the *Seed* of the *Jews* believing in Christ come, be still under the *Covenant*, and *Church-Members* with their Parents, and if so, ought to be Baptised, by Mr. *Tombe's* Concession; Then let the *Believing Gentiles* and their *Seed* come in also, for now no difference between *Jew* and *Greek*, *Gal.* 3. 28. And for more full proof,

the

the Apoſtle tells the *believing Epheſians*, and ſo all *believing Gentiles*, Epheſ. 2. 19. *We are no more ſtrangers* [*from the common-wealth of Iſrael*, v. 12.] but Chriſt having broken down the middle Wall of Partition between the *Jews* and us, v. 14.] *we are now fellow-citizens with the Saints, and of the Houſhold of God.*

For the word *Fellow-citizens*, in the City or Church of the *Jews*: I pray, who were eſteemed *Citizens?* Were not the Children put into *Abraham's* Charter: were not they then Citizens with their Parents? What, hath God ſent his *Quo Warranto*, and taken away *Abraham's* Charter, when the Parents, the Citizens, believe in Chriſt ſincerely, and keep Covenant with him, and walk in the ſteps of *Abraham*: will now God take away their Charter, and caſt out their Seed from being Citizens? What, *hath Chriſt by his blood made us both One, taking down the partition-wall between* Jew *and* Gentile, *v.* 14. And doth he now ſet up the *partition Wall* between the *Jewiſh* believing Parent and his Seed, bringing now the Seed of the believing *Jews* into that condition the *Gentiles* were in before Chriſt came, *Epheſ.* 2. 11, 12. Shall the *Anabaptiſts* make us believe this, unleſs God hath ſaid ſo in expreſs terms? What a Bar had this

been againſt the *Jews* ever receiving the Goſpel: Did they any where make this Objection againſt it? Now we *Gentiles* believing, are *Fellow-citizens* with them of the ſame *Houſhold of God* with them. Are not Children part of the *Houſhold?* Were not the *Jews* Children part of the *Houſhold of God?* then the Apoſtle tells us, we alſo are Fellow-citizens, and of the Houſhold of God, as the *Jews* are.

As for the Texts, *Matth.* 28. and *Mark* 16. Bleſſed Jeſus, the Promiſed Seed to *Abraham*, in whom all Nations ſhould be bleſſed, is now come; fulfilled the Law, Crucified, Dead, Aſcended: Salvation is onely to be had in him. Now this was the *great Doctrine* the Apoſtles were to preach, firſt to the *Jews*, than to the *Gentiles*, and call all Nations to believe in this Chriſt, that they may be *bleſſed*, according to the Promiſe made to *Abraham*. True, none but Adult perſons, or perſons of underſtanding, can underſtand this *Doctrine*, and actually believe in Chriſt. No more could any but *Jews* Adult, or of ripe years, underſtand the Promiſe of Chriſt *to come*, in whom all Nations ſhould be bleſſed; but yet the *Jews* Children were reputed with them Believers in the *Meſſiah to come*, by Gods Covenant with them, and the Church

Conſtituted

Constituted of them. So now Believers in Christ come, their *Seed* are Reputed with them.

*Musculus* [whom my *Author* hath put in his Catalogue of *Authors*, [*hoc. com.* p. 603.] which makes the ignorant *Anabaptist* think he is on their side; but rancks the *Anabaptists* in a second, or lower degree of *Hereticks*, for denying *Infant-baptism*, and an *Oath*.] In answer to an Argument of the *Anabaptists*, *there was a Command for Circumcising, but no express Command for Baptising*. Thus writes, *Facit hoc non contra nos, sed pro nobis*, &c. [*ibid.* 338.] This doth not make against us, but for us, saith he, the sum of his answer [being too long to transcribe all] is this. 'Since God hath plainly declared his Will, that the Infants of 'Believers, whose *Father Abraham* is, should 'be Partakers of the Grace and Sign of the 'Covenant, and no where do we read that 'this Will of God is Repealed; what necessity is there, after such a clear expression of 'his Will, to desire another Command in 'the *New Testament*? Since therefore Christ 'gave no special Command, what should 'be done with the Infants of Believers, he 'did sufficiently intimate to his Apostles, 'who were *Jews*, and brought up among 'the *Jews*, that he did not take away that

'Grace, by which God declared himself to 'be the God, not only of Believers, but 'also of their *Seed*, and that he will have 'them Sealed with the Sign of his Grace. 'To which, do but add, *Matth.* 19. 13, 14, '15. we may see Christ hath not taken 'away this Grace from them. This Answer of *Musculus*, is full and clear, and runs upon that I have been calling for, an Infallible proof of God's Repealing of *Abraham's Covenant*. I have rather wronged *Musculus*, by not Transcribing the whole *Paragraph*, for brevities sake, I desire the *Reader* to view him. For my part, I do not yet see any absurdity, if I should say, as in the fourth Commandment, the morality of it being, that a seventh part of time be set a part for the Worship of God; therefore let God please to change the day, yet that Commandment binds us to sanctify that day. So when God shall please to make a Gracious *Covenant* with Believing *Abraham*, and his *Seed*, and gives Command to have that *Covenant* Sealed, and never declares his Repealing of the *Covenant*, and its Sealing; the *Covenant* standing still in force, though God may please to change the Seal, and bring in another Seal under a new dispensation, yet God's former Command may well warrant us to administer the Sign

and

and Seal of the *Covenant* to *Abraham's Seed*, as before.

Sure I am, this expreſs Command the *Anabaptiſts* require for Baptiſing *Infants*, will caſt out the *Lord's-Day*, and *Magiſtracy* out of a Chriſtian Common-wealth, *Women from the Lord's Table*; For though there were divers Women attended Chriſt, *Luke* 8. 2, 3. yet there was not one of them with him at his Inſtitution of the *Lord's Supper*: nor do we read expreſly, that Women were at the *Lord's Table* in their Churches; For him that would prove it from the words, 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. Δοκιμαζέτω δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτὸν, there tell us, That Ἄνθρωπος is of the *Epiceen Gender*, and includes *Male* and *Female*.

I anſwer, If Ἄνθρωπος did alwaies ſignify *Male* and *Female*, and not the *Male* only, then it were a good proof: but I told twenty places in *Matthew's* Goſpel [I looked no further] where it ſignifies only the *Male*. Beſides, what *Gender* is ἑαυτὸν of, which is joyned with it? Nor can we have ground to Excommunicate Women, if they walk impenitently ſcandalous in the Church.

Partly upon their Principle, who call for expreſs Command, and partly becauſe the caſting out of the *Seed* of Believers, and Repealing the *Covenant*, are ſo ſtrange, that it cannot be proved by any Conſequence I have

have yet met with, therefore I call for Scriptures as clear at leaſt as expreſs Commands, or ſignification of God's Will.

To return to *Infants*, They muſt be regenerate, and have *Faith* ſome way, elſe they muſt all periſh; what ſhould make the thing ſo impoſſible they ſhould have the *Habit* or *Seed* of *Faith*, and of all *ſaving Graces* in them? I hope it is not becauſe Chriſt is known only by Revelation. I pray, what Act of *Faith* in God, what Act of *Love* to God, or *Fear* of God, *&c.* did *Iſaach* or *John* put forth towards God, when, being *Infants* they were *Circumciſed?* yet I am confident they had the *Seeds* of all theſe at that time they were ſanctified then, and why not then a *Seed* of *Faith* in Chriſt? had not *John* it when he leaped? *&c.*

In the firſt *Synod* held in *New-England*, this was one queſtion diſcuſſed; *Whether we be juſtified by the Habit, or the Act of Faith?* Arguments were brought *pro* and *con*, ſome were for the *Habit* of *Faith*, then why not *Infants* juſtified by a *Habit* of *Faith?* Dr. *Ames* in his proofs for *Infant-baptiſm*, makes this his firſt Argument; *That in the very beginning of Regeneration, the Soul is a meer paſſive, the Infant is as capable of a paſſive reception of Chriſt and Grace, as another Man:*

but

*but Baptiſm Seals to our Regeneration.* [*modul. theal. c. 4. th. 12. Cot. of grace, p. 27.* &c. *Socin. pro. ſtig. p. 781.*]

That ſervant of Chriſt Mr. *Tho. Hooker*, proves that Children may have *Faith*, and hath a pretty large diſcourſe upon it; The *Socinians* ſay it is a Dream [if they mean *Actual Faith*, who do not ſay it] *Cælonius* in anſwer to them, proves by ten or eleven Arguments, that Children may have *Faith*, to be ſure, we may obſerve that they whom the *Holy Page* Records to be Godly [except *Menaſſeh*] were ſo from their Child-hood. *Iſaac, Jacob, Samuel, Hezekiah, Joſiah, David, Obadiah, Jehoſhaphat*, where do you read of the Saints firſt running a courſe of wickedneſs, and then Converted? How many Children may we obſerve, that we may ſay as Dr. *Thomas Goodwin* ſaid, are ſanctified from the Womb. What is the matter then, that all *Infants* are caſt out of the Church, and muſt not be Baptiſed?

*Object.* If you ſay, *If you could tell which they are, they ſhould be Baptiſed.*

*Anſw.* Can you tell who have *ſaving-Faith* and *Grace*, though they make Actual Profeſſion, and tell you they have it? they who you ſay are *Droſs, Chaff, Canaanites*, no true *Iſraelites*, in your *Baptiſed Congregations*, they told you they had *Faith*, when

when you Dipped them, but you were miſtaken.

2. If that be yielded, that *Infants* may be Regenerate, may have *Faith* and *Grace Seminally*, then this *Text* which you do ſo talk of does not cut them off from Baptiſm.

3. By *Abraham's Covenant*, let the Parents be viſible Believers, by their competent knowledg of Chriſt, profeſſion of their *Faith* in him, and Converſation in ſome meaſure becoming Chriſtians, giving up themſelves to the Ordinances, and Rules of Chriſt's Houſe, prove themſelves thus to be viſible Chriſtians: and we can as regularly Baptiſe the Children of ſuch Believers, as you Baptiſe your Adult perſons, though as to the reality of *ſaving Faith*, we are miſtaken, and ſo are you.

Once more take the word μαθητεύσατε, *Mat.* 28. 19. as Dr. *Hammond* ſaith it ought to be Tranſlated, *Diſciple ye all Nations*, or make *Diſciples*. Hence the Argument.

*All they that are Diſciples ought to be Baptiſed.*

*But the Children of Believing Parents are Diſciples.*

*Therefore the Children of Believing Parents ought to be Baptiſed.*

This Argument I gave to him who oppoſed

poſed me, but he could not tell which Propoſition to deny; a fit Man to diſpute in a Congregation.

For the proof of the Argument.

The *Major*, is the plain *Text*, there is no oppoſing of that.

The *Minor*, that ſuch Children are Diſciples, our Divines have ſo cleared it from *Acts* 15. 1. and 10. *v.* compared, and other *Texts*, that I will not ſay what they have ſaid before.

I give my thoughts thus, They are Diſciples.

1ſt. By God's Reputation he eſteems them ſo; they are mine ſaith God, born to me. *Ezek.* 16. 20, 21.

2ly, They are ſo by their Parents *Dedication* of them to Chriſt.

3ly, They are ſo by their Parents *Education* of them *for* Chriſt.

4ly, They are ſo, as I may ſay, *jure Gentium*, or rather *jure Religionum*, all Nations, all Religions, take their Children to be the ſame that the Parents are.

Did not the *Jews* take their Children to be *Moſes's Diſciples*, as well as themſelves? *John* 9. 28.

Do not the *Turks* take their Children to be *Mahomet's Diſciples*, as well as themſelves

ſelves? Should you deny it, you ſhould hear of it, if not feel it.

Yea, go the *Indians* whoſe Religion [I may call it ſo] is very Deviliſh and Superſtitious, were it not too good a word. When the *Engliſh* firſt began to dwell in *New-England*, *Maſſaſoit* the *Sachem* of *Mount Hope*, made a League with the *Engliſh* at *Plymouth* to live in Amity with them; The Articles were *Seven*; he kept the League well: A little before his death he comes to renew his League for himſelf and his two Sons, *Alexander* and *Philip*, this was on *September* 25, 1630. But in his Treatiſe he urged this, That the *Engliſh* ſhould engage never to attempt to draw any of his people to the Chriſtian Religion: he inſiſted upon it very much; but the *Engliſh* were reſolute, and would make no League upon ſuch terms. But this we ſee by this *Heathen*, that he would have his Poſterity to be reckoned as he was, though his Religion was Deviliſh.

If then the Children of *Jews*, *Turks*, *Pagans* be reckoned with the Parents, why muſt not the Children of Believers in Chriſt be reckoned Diſciples of Chriſt with their Parents.

The Reader I ſuppoſe will pardon me, though

though I make a little Digreſſion: The Wars between the *Indians* and the *Engliſh* in *New-England*, I ſuppoſe muſt have heard. This *Philip* the Son of *Maſſaſoit*, before-mentioned, was he that began the Wars with the *Engliſh*, 1675. which laſted till 1677. The *Engliſh* when they ſaw *Maſſaſoit* ſtand ſo upon that *Article*, then ſaid, *That God would root out the Poſterity of that* Maſſaſoit; and ſo now it is come to paſs.

That Story which my worthy Friend Mr. *William Hubbard* gives us of *Paſſalonaway*, [the moſt noted *Paneaw* or *Sorcerer*; and I believe the oldeſt man in the Country. When I ſaw him, he was reckoned one of the oldeſt men of the *Indians*, but I perceived by the time of his dying, he lived about thirty years after] is worthy the obſerving. About *Merimach* River, *Anno* 1660, ſeveral *Sagamoors* meeting together, there was a great Dance: Theſe Solemnities are the Times when the moſt Ancient tell Stories, and tranſmit them to their Poſterity. *Paſſalonaway* being preſent made his laſt Speech, and took his Farewel: thus,

'I am ready to die, and not likely ever 'to ſee you meet any more; I will now 'leave this word of Councel with you;

'That

'That you take heed how you quarrel with 'the *Engliſh*, for though you may do them 'much miſchief, yet aſſuredly you will 'all be deſtroyed and rooted out of the 'Earth if you do; for I was as much an 'Enemy to the *Engliſh* at their firſt com-'ing into theſe Parts, as any one what-'ever, and did try all waies and means 'poſſible to have deſtroyed them, at leaſt 'to have prevented their ſitting down 'here, but I could no way effect it. There-'fore I adviſe you never to contend with 'the *Engliſh*, nor make War with them. 'Accordingly his eldeſt Son *Wonnalancot*, 'as ſoon as he perceived the *Indians* were 'up in Arms, he withdrew himſelf into 'ſome remote place, that he might not be 'hurt by the *Engliſh*, or their Enemies.

## SECT. VI.

TO return to my *Author*: His *Sixth* Queſtion is, *Whether Baptiſm did ſucceed in the room and uſe of Circumciſion?* He ſaith, *By no means.*

But the Body of our Learned and Pious Divines ſay, *It doth*, and our Divines have

have ſpoken to it ſo often, that I am loath to ſay any thing to it. Shortly my thoughts were theſe:

1. *Circumciſion* came in upon *Faith*: *Abraham* believed, then he was Circumciſed: And ſo doth *Baptiſm*.

2. Circumciſion did *ſign Chriſt to come in the fleſh*. So ſaith my Author; and Baptiſm *ſigns he is come in the fleſh*.

3. Circumciſion did ſignifie [you may ſay Seal] the *Righteouſneſs of Faith*: So doth *Baptiſm*.

4. *Circumciſion* ſignified *Sanctification*: ſo do *Baptiſm*.

5. Circumciſion ſignified and ſealed the *Covenant* between *God* and the *Seed* of *Abraham*, Gen. 17. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. So doth *Baptiſm*.

6. *Circumciſion* did oblige *Iſrael* to walk with God: ſo *Baptiſm* obligeth us.

7. *Circumciſion* did diſtinguiſh *Iſrael* from other Nations: ſo *Baptiſm* diſtinguiſheth us.

Circumciſion reſpecting Chriſt *to come*, and Baptiſm *Chriſt come*. Hence the *Jews* though circumciſed, yet coming under a new Diſpenſation, ought to be baptized: much more reaſon for this, than for *Timothy*, who being a Diſciple, *Acts* 16. 1. no queſtion was baptized, and yet after that circumciſed by *Paul*, v. 3.

*Circumciſion* (ſaith my Author) *was to be a Bond and Obligation to keep the whole Law of* Moſes: *but Baptiſm is contrary.*

*Anſ.* 1. For the Moral Law, the Rule of our Obedience, Baptiſm doth not ſolve us from that, but bind us to it: for *Sanctification* is held forth in our *Baptiſm*.

2. As for the *Ceremonial Law* where *Chriſt* was ſet forth in *ſhadows*, no wonder, though when Chriſt is come, and the ſhadow's gone, that *Baptiſm* was contrary to it. *Evangelium relatum & Revelatum.* But what doth this hurt us?

3. *Paul* did not Circumcife *Timothy*, with that reſpect to *Circumciſion*; the *Jews* did. The *Jews* did look to be *juſtified* by the obſervation of the *moral* and *ceremonial*

*Law*

*Law* both, *Gal.* 5.3. the 4th *verse* unties the knot. The false Apostles urged Circumcision, *Acts* 15.1. according to the *Law of Moses.* [But Circumcision is not of *Moses*, but the Fathers, saith our Lord, *John* 7. 22.] *If you Circumcise thus, and seek Justification thus, you are fallen from grace*, Gal. 5.4.

My Author goes on; *Circumcision initiated the carnal Seed into a carnal Church, and gave them right to carnal Ordinances: But Baptism was to give the spiritual Seed an orderly entrance into the spiritual Church.*

*Anſ.* 1. These Carnal Ordinances had their Spiritual significations as well as ours.

2. The Element in Baptism, *Water*; do but *wash the flesh*, and may be said to be Carnal too in some sense, 1 *Pet.*3.21.

3. There was a Spiritual Seed admited also into that Church by Circumcision, as well as now by Baptism, how many Saints were in that Church?

4. *Chaff*, *Dross*, *Canaanites* are no Spiritual Seed, yet such have been admitted into your Spiritual Church, by *Dipping*.

Mr. *Hutcheſon* writes true and can teſtifie it.

5. Define a Church, and you ſhall find all the Cauſes in that Church [a difference only between a Church, and *ſuch a Church*] take it in the ſtricteſt notion. 1. The *efficient* Cauſe is *God*, that is here. *Deut.* 7. 6. *Ezra* 9. 21. 3ly, The *formal* Cauſe joyned in Covenant, with God and one with another, *Deut.* 29. 12. *Zech.* 11. 10,14. *Exod.*24.8. [Beſides their Circumciſion.] This ſome Brethren make the *form* of a Church: here it is. 4ly, *Final* Cauſe, To walk with God, and keep his Ordinances: it was here, *Exod.* 24. 7. Mr. *Baxter* hath ſpoken ſo much to this, that I ſay no more.

*Women were not circumciſed*, ſaith my Author.

*Anſ.* No, how could they? 1. The Apoſtle gives you an anſwer, 1 *Cor.* 11. 3. 2ly, *Rivet* ſaith well; *Sed quia in viris actinum, ut loquuntur, generationis & propagationis hominum eſt principium, quo tranſmittunt corruptionem in poſteros, ſignum ideo obtinuit in præcipuo ſexu, ita tamen, ut fœminæ viris annexæ & in iis cenſerentur, qui familiorum capitæ debebant eſſe.*

For

For *Acts* 38. 39. which my Author oppoſeth, and brings in Biſhop *Taylor*, [a man croſs to the Doctrine of the Church of *England* in point of Original Sin.] And Dr. *Hammond* on his ſide, telling us, It is an *Uncludent Argument to infer Baptiſm from hence.* [*I do not wonder that* Anabaptiſts *make ſo much uſe of Dr.* Taylor.]

*Anſw.* With the Biſhop's favour, there is a difference between theſe two Phraſes, The *Children of Iſrael*, and this; *You and your children.* Here is a Copulative Conjunction which is not there. They were the wounded Perſons to whom *Peter* ſpeaks, that asked him a *queſtion*, but their Children did not ask, nor were preſent with them moſt likely.

*Calvin* ſaith, *Notandi autem, &c. But the three degrees are to be noted, to whom the Promiſe is made,* 1. *To the* Jews. 2. *To their Children.* 3. *To the* Gentiles.

As for Dr. *Hammond*, though I honour him much for his great Learning one way, yet I think as to an Argument, whether it be Concludent or not, other men may know as well as he. *Voſſius*, *Rivet*, *Calvin*, *Gerhard*, *Aretius*, and the *Aſſembly of Divines*, [though ſlighted by him] do all conclude *Infant-baptiſm* from hence; they

could judge of a Concludent Argument.

1. What this *Promiſe* is, I ſee there are very different Apprehenſions. Some take it to be that in *Joel* 2. 28. So Dr. *Hammond*, and divers others. The *Dutch* ſay, *Joel* 2. 28. & *Gen.* 17. 7. *Aha ide* ſaith, The *Promiſed Seed in whom all Nations ſhould be bleſſed.* Thus *Aretius*, The *Promiſe of the* Meſſiah, *and the benefits that come by him, made to* Abraham *and his Seed*, Gen. 13. To which the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 9. 4. hath a reſpect, *the Promiſes belong to them.* Thus *Aretius*, and *Horino* inclines this way.

2ly, whatever the *Promiſe* be, it was that which the *Jews* and their Children were now under, [*For to you do the benefit of that Promiſe appertain if you will lay hold of it*, ſaith Dr. *Hammond* on Text.] The Promiſe did appertain to them, both Parents and Children, but not to the *Gentiles* as yet till they be called.

3ly, That τέκνον is a general word I grant, ſeven or eight times uſed for little Children in the *New Teſtament. Fit mentitio liberorum* ἀπλῶς *ſine diſcretione ætatis*, ſaith *Voſſius*. Let your Children be little or great, to your Children the Promiſe doth belong,

belong, as well as to you. *Matth.* 27. 25. *His Blood be upon us,* καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν *and upon your Children*; were not there the Children distinct from the Parents? and do not Children there signify their little ones, their posterity, of what Age soever? would Bishop *Taylor* deny it? and 'tis probable that God brought this Imprecation to mind, and *Peter* may aim at that.

Be the promise what it will then, I would try for one Argument from hence.

They that are *Church-Members* ought to be Baptised.

But Children of Believing Parents are *Church-Members.*

Therefore, they ought to be Baptised.

The *Major*, the *Doctor*, nor any else will deny.

The *Minor*, I prove thus.

They to whom *Promises* do appertain, they are *Church-Members.*

But to the Children of Believing Parents *Promises* do appertain. Therefore,

The *Major* is plain, no *Promise* belong to any person out of the *Visible Church.* Ephes. 2. 12. while the *Ephesians* were out of the *Visible Church, they were Strangers from the Covenants of Promise.* Rom. 9. 4. the *Promise* did belong to the *Jews*, not to

us *Gentiles*, till grafted into *Abraham*'s ſtock.

The *Minor* is proud from the words of the Apoſtle, *The Promiſe is to you, and your Children*, we are under the outward diſpenſation now; you nor your Children ſhall loſe your Title to it, by Repenting and Believing, but then you ſhall feel the ſaving benefit added to your outward Title. Again,

'Will you reſtrain the promiſe to the 'gift of the Spirit, as the Verſe before; Dr. 'Hammond moves the Queſtion? what kind 'of gifts theſe were, inward or outward, for 'both theſe are promiſed indefinitely to 'Believers. *Joh.* 7. 38, 39. there the in-'ward gifts, enabling humble ſincere Chri-'ſtians, for the Duties of a Chriſtian Life, 'called, *The Renewing of the Holy Ghoſt. Tit.* '3. 5. joyned to the *Laver* of Regenerati-'on; he concludes 'tis beſt to comprehend 'both. Thus Dr. *Hammond* on the *Text*.

Let me add, If the Spirit be here meant, it muſt be ſo underſtood, that it may be the benefit of as many as ever God ſhall call to the Worlds End, be they never ſo many Millions; the words πᾶσι and ὅσους will force it. The *Promiſe* is to *All*, as many, be they never ſo many, if called. There are *many called, few choſen*, but if called, there is an out-

outward Title to it, and to their Children, elſe the Sentence is not full; and I proved before we are fellow-Citizens of the ſame houſhold, grafted *into the ſame ſtock*, *Jew* and *Greek* all one: The *Jews* and their Children were under it, when not effectually called. *The Promiſe is to you and your Children*, now they were Children of the *Covenant*. *Act.* 3. 25. nor can there be any reaſon given, why the Children of the Believing *Gentile* ſhould not be included, and meant here, as well as of the *Jews*. Hence, ſince the *Doctor* thus interprets the *Promiſe* of the *Spirit*.

They to whom the *Promiſe* of the renewing *Spirit* doth belong, they may be Baptiſed.

But to the Children of Believing Parents, the *Promiſe* of the renewing *Spirit* doth belong, as it did to the *Jews*. Therefore the Children of Believing Parents may be Baptiſed.

That there can be Regeneration without the Spirit, no Chriſtian will affirm. That there can be a Heavenly Inheritance without Regeneration the Scripture denies. That the Spirit of God cannot Regenerate an *Infant*, he muſt be a ſtrange Chriſtian, [if any at all] who dares ſay it. If *John*

was

was filled with the *Spirit*, from his Mothers Womb, God can give his Spirit to other *Infants*, though in a leſs meaſure.

As to the *Text* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. that *Text* hath been ſo cleared by our Divines, that I wonder my *Author* ſhould not be ſatisfied, but to come up with his *Ligitimacy*, as if that were the ſenſe of *Children being Holy*. When as

1ſt. The Apoſtle is not writing to a *Corinthian Husband*, that had two Wives, but only one Wife; as 12, 13, 14. *v.* ſo that if that *Text*, *Mat.* 2. 15. could be brought to prove a Matrimonial-Holineſs, then they were Holy, and Children Holy, before the Goſpel came; but this is a Holineſs ariſing from one of the Parents, being a Believer: Beſides, *Joſeph*, *Benjamin*, *Solomon*, and divers others, were never called *Baſtards*, or thought to be ſo, though *Jacob* and *David* had more Wives then one.

2ly, Then all the Children in *Corinth*, though the Parents were lawfully Marryed, were *Baſtards*, before the Goſpel came.

3ly, When then the Apoſtle writes to the Saints in *Corinth.* 1 *Cor.* 1, 2. 2 *Cor.* 1. 1. the meaning is, *to you that are Legitimate, and not Baſtards in Corinth.* What difference between ἁγίοις there, and ἅγια here? Neither

ther do your examples from בהר and קדש help you at all.

For 1ſt. By an *Antiphraſis*, or *Euphemiſmus*, the words ſignifies the quite contrary, *Bleſs*, and *Curſe*, *Holy*, and *Unclean*; [or *Sodomite*, as we Tranſlate.]

2ly, The words are ſo uſed in an oppoſite ſenſe, in ſeveral other *Scriptures*, that prove one another.

3ly, The ſenſe of the *Text* forces us ſo to render their ſignification.

1. But then you muſt Tranſlate αγιον by ſome word which is quite contrary to *Holineſs*, ſo that one expel the other: *Contraria ſunt pellentis naturæ*, but *Legitimacy* and *Holineſs* are not contraries in reſpect of this Subject, for he may be *Legitimate* and *Holy* too, I know: you muſt then read *elſe were your Children unclean, but now they are unclean.* This is good Senſe.

2. As the word *Holy*, is never taken in the *Holy Page* for *Legitamacy*, nor can you juſtify it by any *Text*, as we can the former, clearly by ſeveral *Texts*. A *Seed* according to God's Inſtitution in Marriage, according to his appointment, Ordination in *Mat.* 2. 15. and the *Holy Seed. Ezra.* 9. 2. differ very much: beſides, as I ſaid, the Children of the *Corinthians* were *Holy*, if

that

that were the Sense before the Gospel came.

3. Nor is there the least pressing necessity why it should not be taken, as in the *Scriptures* I mention. Nay, there is a presing necessity to force that it cannot be meant *Legitimacy*, because it follows upon the *Faith* of one Parent, which *Legitimacy* doth not.

For ἐξουσία which you say alwaies signifies *Authority*, yet 1 *Cor.* 11. 15. [I suppose you mean the tenth] it signifies a *Vail.*

*Ans.* Who translated the word so? I have viewed nine *Translators*, and they render it *Power* as we do. *A Metonimy* of the Subject, we know there is the meaning being, a covering in sign that she is under the *Authority* of her Husband. *Gen.* 24. 65. A Phrase whereby the thing signified is ascribed to the Sign, the propriety of the word is here meant and intended; that she shew her self to be under *Authority*. The *Aethiopick* Translation, to give the Sense, turn the *Substantive* into a *Verb*; but hower, this doth not at all suit your design. In the word *Holy*, here is no *Metonimy*, *Sign*, or thing signified.

I see nothing of moment more to answer, *and I doubt not my Author hath been better answered by others, though I saw none, till I had done.*

SECT.

## SECT. VII.

THen my *Author* proceeds to the manner of Baptiſing, and tells us what βαπτίζειν ſignifies; quotes *Biſhop Taylor*, *Doctor Hammond*, and many that ſay it ſignifies *Immerſion*; and who is ſo ignorant, that knows not this? but is my *Author* ſo knowing, that he can prove it ſignifies only *Immerſion*, or dowzing a perſon over head and ears? did *Biſhop Taylor*, and *Doctor Hammond* Baptiſe ſo, and only ſo? let him enquire. Why did not my *Author* prove that the word ſignifies only ſo, in *Heb.* 9. 10. 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. [ſomething you would ſay to this, but 'tis pittyful] *Mark* 7. 4. *Luke* 11. 38. the *Phariſee* marvelled that Chriſt ὃ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη had not firſt Baptiſed before Dinner; How the *Jews* uſe to waſh hands, you may gueſs, by 2 *Kings* 3. 11. when *Eliſha* waited on *Elijah*; *He powred water on the hands of Elijah*, did not *Elijah* then Baptiſe, or waſh his hands? was not the *Baſon* and *Ewer*, and the little *Ciſterns* with Water, common in *England*, and in ſome places ſtill to this day? and do we not waſh

wash by letting of Water run upon our hands, or powring upon them.

That the *Holy Ghost* is signified you tell us; and three times Baptising with the *Holy Ghost*, is expressed by powering of the *Holy Ghost*.

What our *Authors* have said about their practice in hotter Countries, where Baptism was first Instituted, you know; there they did commonly wash, you were bound by the Law to wash. 2 *Sam.* 11. 4. with *Levit.* 15. 19. and 18, 19. So *Pharaoh's* Daughter. *Exod.* 2. 5. but in our cold Climates, this is not so common.

However, to me it seems strange, that there should be so much stress put upon Baptism, and so much upon the manner of Baptising, as the *Anabaptists* lay, and yet the *Holy Page* hath not Recorded how it should be performed. To Baptise an *Infant*, I could do as Mr. *Chancy* did in *New-England*, and as of old they did in *England*; as an Antient Gentleman, of good quality in *Suffolk* told me, *He remembred the practice, by a good token, One Infant was so fowled with its green Excrement, when it came to be Dipped*, [a handsome sight in a Congregation, when we are about Holy Things] that he could not forget it; bnt how to Baptise an

*Adult*

*Adult* perſon, and heavy Body, I cannot tell. If they go into the Water, into the Element, they Baptiſe themſelves ſo far as their body is in the Water; The *Baptiſt* doth not Dip that part.

As for their Clothes, I hope they do not go in with them, to Baptiſe, or Waſh them. certainly there ought to be an immediate Aplication of the Sign, [the Water] to the Body; that our Baptiſm hath a reference to the *Ezek.* 16. 4. I ſee ſeveral Men conclude, and have ſhown us how this Cuſtom of Waſhing new born Babes was derived almoſt to all Nations, but neither then, nor now do our Women put on a Shirt, or any thing upon the *Infant*, and then waſh it, but they apply the Water immediately to the Body; I am ſure it ſhould be ſo in Baptiſm. *Voſſius* gives us large *Teſtimonies* out of Antient Writers, how that *Men*, *Women*, and *Children*, in thoſe Countries, were all Baptiſed. [*De Baptis. p.* 350.] [I wonder the *Anabaptiſts* ſhould be ſo angry with Mr. *Baxter*] becauſe he ſaith they Baptiſe naked, the *Women* only had a little covering before them, (yea they had a Myſtery in the pulling off their Clothes, to ſhew their pulling off the *Old Man*, ſome where I have read,) after their Dipping, they were Annointed.

nointed. When a tumult arose in the City about *Chrysostom*, how the *Women* that were about Baptising, ran away naked; with other things there we may read.

Certainly God's Institutions are such, that we may Celebrate them at Noon-day, before all Men, let them be Spectators; and if this must be the way, let them Baptise for me, and Annoint too if they please.

So that *Modesty* and *Life*, be preserved, I am of *Cyprian's*, and *Austin's* mind in this Point, who left it indifferent, so you do not absolutely tye us up to one, and deny all Baptism by Dipping. [*Cypr.* 249. *Aust.* 10. 3. *p.* 207.]

Other Divines have answered this more fully, and therefore I break off.

Here a Question falls in, which I never did so much as think of, till now I say Mr. *Mode*, *That Water in Baptism, he saith, hath no respect to the blood of Christ; that it doth concur in the Mystery by way of efficacy and merit, he grants, but not as the thing there figured, for that is the Spirit?* This may help as to the manner of Baptising.

I thought both *Spirit* and *Blood*, he denies the latter, and saith the *Church of England* doth so also, as he thinks.

The

The Queſtion is new to me, I ſhall hardly propound my thoughts.

1. If cleanſing of the Soul from Sin be the thing Baptiſm holds out, then, what doth primacily, properly, and effectually cleanſe, is there ſignifyed, *but the Antecedent is true:* Cleanſing is as much given to the Blood of Chriſt, as to the Spirit. 1 *Joh.* 1. 7. *Apoc.* 1. 5. *Hebr.* 9. 14. 22. *Almoſt all things were purged by Blood.*

2ly, We read three times, *Mark* 1. 4. *Luke* 3. 3. *Acts* 2. 38. that Remiſſion of Sins is ſignifyed and Sealed in Baptiſm; but how can this be, if there is no reſpect to his Blood in Baptiſm? *Without Blood there is n oRemiſſion*, *Heb.* 9. 22. Why is it called *Baptiſm for remiſſion of ſins?*

3ly, Why are we ſaid in Baptiſm to have *Communion* with Chriſt in his Death, and buryed with him in Baptiſm? *Rom.* 6. 3. It ſhould rather be ſaid *buryed with the Spirit*, if the Spirit only be ſignifyed. Doth not the Death of Chriſt comprehend in it, the effuſion of his Blood?

4ly, It is certain, that in the *Types* of the *Old Teſtament*, by Water the blood of

Chriſt was ſignifyed. *Numb.* 19. 9. The Water is ſaid to be a *Purification for Sin.* In the *Hebrew* it's a Sin, the word often uſed for a *Sin Offering*, the *Dutch* render it, *It is an Expiation.* Have not that Fountain, *Zech.* 13. 1. ſet open a reſpect to the blood of Jeſus? all the *Interpreters* I ſee, reſpect both his Blood and Spirit: Why not then ſo in Baptiſm.

5ly, As we are filthy, are we not as guilty? Is there nothing in the Ordinance to reſpect our guilt? then it were ſad, yea, guilt being upon us, can God give out the bleſſing of Regeneration to us, till in order his juſtice be firſt ſatisfied? though Regeneration and Pardon are *ſimul tempore?*

To ſay it concurrs by way of *efficacy* and *merit*, ſo it doth in any Ordinance to make it effectual. But Remiſſion of Sins being in a ſpecial manner ſealed up in this Ordinance, which is only by Chriſts Blood, methinks the Element ſhould have a reſpect to his Blood.

The utter Abolition of Sin, both guilt and power is given to the Blood of Chriſt alone: but taking away guilt, is not given to the Spirit.

6ly,

6ly, Out of the ſide of our Bleſſed Lord when he was pierced, came Blood and Water. *Joh.* 19.34. There is our Pardon, and Sanctification: If both theſe be ſignified in our Baptiſm, why is not that Blood and Water of his ſignifyed in this Water in Baptiſm?

Hence *Alcinus*'s Baptiſm was ſignified in the paſſion of Chriſt, by the Water and Blood which came from his ſide; Several Verſes he hath upon it. [*Cent. 6. f.* 112.]

In That Tract which go under *Cyprian*'s Name. *Baptizabantur in nube, & mari Hebræi, & jam Spiritu ſancto & ſanguine Chriſti, mundatur a peccatis populus Dei.* [*De Reſur. Chri.*]

Hence *Ambroſe* ſpeaking of Baptiſm— *Ideoq; legiſti, quod tres Teſtes in Baptiſmate unum ſunt, aqua, ſanguis; & ſpiritusqui ſi unum horum detrahas, non ſtat Baptiſmatis Sacramentum: quid enim eſt aqua ſine cruce Chriſti?* [*Deris qui c.* 4.]

Hence *Luther*, *Baptizari nihil aliud eſt quum reſeo illo, & precioſo ſanguine Chriſti, lanari, & mundari.*

*Res ſignificata in Baptiſmo eſt ſanguis Chriſti.* Walæu. *to.* 1. *p.* 84. I could produce more Authors.

The Application of the Blood of Chriſt, and the renewing of the Spirit, without both which our State cannot be happy, I think may both be ſignified, and theſe either by Dipping, or powering of Water: *The ſprinkling of the Blood of Jeſus* [ſet out of old by the Ceremonial ſprinkling] is a famous Sentence in the Goſpel. *Heb.* 12. 24. and 1 *Pet.* 1. 2. ſo the *powering out of the Spirit*, *Tit.* 3. 5, 6. *Ezek.* 36. 25. *Iſa.* 52. 15. *Joel* 2. 28, 29. *Prov.* 1. 23.

The Aboliſhing of Sin, is the end of all; [Lord what a do is here before we can be delivered from the miſery we have brought our ſelves into! what an Evil is Sin!] now this is not ſet down one way, but ſeveral waies in Scripture, ſometimes by mortification, or the Death of Sin. Dipping ſets out that, *Buried with Chriſt*, ſometimes by cleanſing, and by purging. *Heb.* 9. 14. 1 *Jo.* 1. 9. *Apoc.* 1. 5. But the grave do not repreſent that, we do not uſe to purge, and cleanſe, by Burying, but this we do by powring Water upon our Hands, upon Rooms, Tables, *&c.* we can cleanſe that way, purge me with *Hyſſop*. *Pſal.* 51. 7. How was that? *Levit.* 14. 6, 7. *Numb.* 19. 18. not by Dipping.

Whither then you Dip, or pour Water.

Here

Here is, 1. The ſame Sign, or Element. 2ly, Here is the ſame thing ſignified, the Spirit, and Blood of Chriſt. 3ly. The ſame end aimed at, the taking away, or purgeing of Sin; nor did I ever contend with any Man about Dipping, but to deny all Baptiſm, unleſs by Dipping, and ſo ſet up Rebaptiſing, and to adminiſter Baptiſm only to *Adult* perſons, excluding all the Children of Believing Parents; This I could never yield to.

To conclude, though I was moved to publiſh my Notes by ſome Friends, yet had I not received this Challenge, (for ſo I may call it) by this Letter, I think I ſhould never have done it, becauſe I knew Men far more able than my ſelf, had done more ſervice, than I could do in the Controverſie.

I wiſh the *Anabaptiſts*, before they had Condemned, and wrote againſt *Infant-baptiſm*, had well ſtudyed, and well improved their Parental, and *Infant-baptiſmal Covenant*, followed God cloſe for the benefits, and waited, though they found temptations, and did not meet with all they would, and reproved others for neglecting, and vigorouſly ſtirred up people to the ſerious improvement of them; Then had they done

done good ſervice to Chriſt and his Church: Whereas by the courſe they have taken, they have increaſed our Diviſions, (a thing deeply to be lamented) which I ſhall never live to ſee healed.

I ſhall only deſire the *Anabaptiſts* to give me anſwer to theſe two Queſtions, clearly from *Scripture.*

Queſt. 1. *Since God was ſo Gracious to make a Covenant with* Abraham *and his* Seed, *and it did then conſiſt with his Wiſdom, to Conſtitute his Church of Parents and Children, while the Parents did believe in the* Meſſiah to come, *why may it not conſiſt with his Grace to continue that Covenant, and with his Wiſdom, ſtill to Conſtitute his Goſpel-Church of Parents and Children, the* Jews *now believing in Chriſt come?*

If God hath plainly declared his pleaſure to the contrary, tell us where, and we are ſatisfied: but you muſt produce other Scriptures then you have done yet.

Queſt. 2. *If God hath repealed his Covenant, with the Believing* Jews Seed, *turned their Children out of the Church, and deny them Baptiſm, though the* Jews *truly Believe in*

*in Chriſt come, what hath God left in the room of theſe, that carry any ſhew of his Bleſſing, or good Will towards their Children, during their Infant State?*

As to their Internall and Eternal State, the Infants were in as good a State then, as now? Chriſt is Yeſterday, to Day, and the ſame for ever, the Lamb ſlain for the Foundation of the World. *Apoc.* 13. 8. But as to their viſible State, how come they to be in the ſame condition, that we *Gentiles*, and our Children were in. *Epheſ.* 2. 12. Before Chriſt came, and we believed in him?

I ſtate the Queſtion, concerning the *Jews* Believing in Chriſt come. As for the *Believing Gentiles*, I ſhall let them alone, till I ſee how you prove the caſting out of the Seed of the *Believing Jews*.

---

*FINIS.*